William Ellis,

VS.

Detective Jeffrey Yasenchack, et al.,

In the United States District Court For the Northern District of Ohio Eastern Division Case No. 1:22-cv-00815

Jeffrey Yasenchack

Friday, July 14, 2023

Reporter Denise Cardona





Court Reporting & Videotaping www.tacklacourtreporting.com 216-241-3918 fax: 216-241-3935

1020 Ohio Savings Plaza 1801 East 9th Street Cleveland, OH 44114

```
1
               IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2
                 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
3
                          EASTERN DIVISION
4
5
    WILLIAM ELLIS,
                               )
6
 7
                Plaintiff,
8
                               )
                                    JUDGE SOLOMON OLIVER, JR.
9
                                    CASE NO. 1:22-CV-00815
       -VS-
10
11
    DET. JEFFREY YASENCHACK, )
12
    Et al.,
13
14
                Defendants.
15
16
17
       Deposition of JEFFREY YASENCHACK, taken as if upon
18
    examination before Denise Cardona, a Notary Public
19
    within and for the State of Ohio, at the offices of
20
    Friedman, Gilbert, & Gerhardstein located at 50 Public
21
    Square, Suite 1900, Cleveland, Ohio, at 10:00 a.m., on
22
    Friday, July 14, 2023, pursuant to notice and/or
23
    stipulations of counsel.
24
25
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
                 On behalf of the Plaintiff
3
    JOSEPH F. SCOTT, ESQ.
4
    Scott & Winters
5
    Terminal Tower
6
    50 Public Square, Suite 1900
7
    Cleveland, Ohio 44113
8
    216-650-3318
9
    Jscott@ohiowagelawyers.com
10
                 On behalf of the Defendants:
11
    JR RUSSELL, ESQ.
12
    CARLI R. YOUNG, ESQ.
13
    City of Cleveland
14
    Department of Law
15
    9601 Lakeside Avenue, Room 106
16
    Cleveland, Ohio 44114
17
    216-644-276712
18
    Jrussell2@clevelandohio.gov
19
    Cyoung2@clevelandohio.gov
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX			
2				
3	EXAMINATION OF JEFFREY YASENCHACK:			PAGE/LINE
4	BY MR. SCOTT:			4/6
5				
6	EXHIBIT INDEX			
7				
8	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT	PAGE/LIN	E DESCRIPTI	CON
9	1	7/13	Affidavit for	search
10			warrant	
11	2	12/16	Case informat	ion
12	3	29/4	Duty Report	
13	4	43/2	Departmental	Information
14	5	62/13	Duty Report	
15	6	62/19	Duty Report	
16	7	66/12	Journal Entry	and Opinion
17				
18			_	
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 3 Jeffrey Yasenchack, of lawful age, being first 4 duly sworn, testified upon his oath as follows: 5 EXAMINATION OF JEFFREY YASENCHACK 6 BY MR. SCOTT: 7 Please let the record reflect that we are here 8 today for the deposition of Jeffrey Yasenchack, being 9 taken in the matter of William Ellis, versus Detective 10 Yasenchack, et al. This case pending in the United 11 States District Court, For the Northern District of 12 Ohio, before the Honorable Judge Solomon Oliver, Jr. 13 Mr. Yasenchack, my name is Joseph Scott. 14 we've asked you to come here today to ask you a number 15 of questions relative to the complaint that has been 16 filed and the allegations asserted in that complaint. 17 You understand that, correct? 18 I do. Α. 19 Have you ever had your deposition taken in a 20 civil matter before? 21 Α. I think I had one years ago on an accident. 22 0. Okay. 23 A traffic accident. Δ 24 Let me just say a couple of things. And I 25 appreciate that some of the questions today may test

5

6

7

8

9

- your memory a little bit, and if you don't recall,
 that's certainly appropriate, just tell me you don't
 recall and we'll move on.
 - I'm going to be asking you questions, of course.

 And if there's anything that I ask that isn't clear to you, please tell me and I'll try to rephrase my question. Otherwise, I'm going to assume that you are going to answer my questions to the best of your ability; is that fair?
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. If at any time you want to stop, take a break, I appreciate it's a little stuffy in here, just tell me and we will take a break. I only ask that you answer whatever question is pending before we break; is that okay?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Would you please state your full name for the record.
- 19 A. Jeffrey Yasenchack.
- Q. And my understanding is you are now retired from
 the City of Cleveland Police Department; is that
 correct?
- 23 A. I am.
- Q. And are you currently employed or just enjoying retirement?

- 1 A. Enjoying retirement.
- 2 Q. Very good. Fair enough.
- And when you retired Friday the City of
- 4 | Cleveland, your last duty assignment would have been as
- 5 Detective; is that correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 O. With what unit?
- 8 A. The Fifth District Vice Unit.
- 9 Q. How long had you been in the Fifth District Vice
- 10 | **Unit?**
- 11 A. Probably close to seven or eight years.
- Q. Okay. All right. Were you eligible for the drop program --
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. -- when you retired?
- You just elected not to participate in that?
- 17 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. All right. We're obviously here to talk
- 19 about the investigation, subsequent criminal cases
- 20 involving William Ellis. And you were at least one of
- 21 the detectives involved in at least two investigations
- 22 of Mr. Ellis; is that fair?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. The first investigation would have been on or

about March 4th of 2019; is that correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Correct.
 - Q. And that arose out of a traffic stop that you initiated on Mr. Ellis, while driving his vehicle?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. And the second investigation would have been related to a search warrant affidavit that was executed on or about May 14, 2020; does that sound about right?
- A. Sounds about right.
- Q. Okay. Let's just get to that. I'm going to mark this.

12

13 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 was marked
14 for purposes of identification.)

15 - - -

Q. Mr. Yasenchack, I'm going to hand you what we're going to mark, for the purposes of this deposition, as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.

And if you could please take a few minutes and look that over. We'll be going through this off and on today.

Okay? And first of all, what I've handed you, marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, do you recognize that as a copy of an affidavit for a search warrant that you executed on or about May 14th of 2020?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23

24

25

- 1 Α. Yes.
 - Okay. And prior to executing this search 0. warrant, am I correct that you had been involved in an earlier investigation and subsequent criminal prosecution of Mr. Ellis in the Cuyahoga County Court of
- 7 Α.

Yes.

- Okay. And that was, again, the 2019 case that 0. followed the traffic stop that you initiated on March 4th of 2019; is that correct?
- 11 Α. Yes.
 - And am I correct that the 2019 case Okav. 0. involved an suppression hearing concerning evidence that was collected during the March 4, 2019 traffic stop?

MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

Go ahead.

Common Pleas; is that correct?

- Ο. Do you recall that?
- 18 That case ended up being -- having a Α. Yeah. 19 suppression hearing.
 - Okay. And did you testify at the expression 0. hearing?
- 22 I did. Α.
 - Okay. You would agree with me that the Court Q. ultimately suppressed all of the evidence that was collected on March 4, 2019, correct?

1 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And part of the basis for the Court's suppression was the Court's conclusion following the hearing that you were not credible?

MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

Go ahead.

- Q. Is that your recollection?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now how would that typically work? How would you typically work with the prosecutor's office when there was a criminal case pending, where you were one of the detectives involved? Would you meet with them regularly? How did that work, in general?
- A. Yeah. We would -- you would meet with the prosecutor.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Just go over.
- Q. Were those -- I guess I'm just trying to figure out how that worked.

You know, was it formal? Would they reach out to you and schedule a meeting? Or would you just simply drop into their offices? How did that work?

A. You know, sometimes they sent out a subpoena to meet at their office to discuss the case. Or sometimes they would just call you up to request you to come.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. All right. And did you have a fairly close working relationship with the folks in the prosecutor's office?
 - A. Yeah. Some of the prosecutors, yes.
- Q. What about the prosecutors that were involved in the 2019 criminal prosecution to Mr. Ellis, were those folks that you had worked with before?
 - A. A prosecutor I worked with a couple of times.
- Q. Are these people that you would recognize and see them if you saw them out and about?
- 11 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And do you recall, as regards to 2019 criminal case, how you came to first contact the prosecutor's office with the initial case information?
 - A. You mean, like, got the case started?
 - Q. Correct.
 - A. Like, how we initiated the case?
- Q. Yes, sir.
- A. We fill out a, like, a case packet. And it just goes eventually to the prosecutor's office.
- Q. Okay. Just through some inner office mail? You don't take it over, it gets dropped off?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then after they review it, do they -would they have reached out to you to follow up on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

information in the initial case packet?

- A. From that point, it would be scheduled for a Grand Jury.
- Q. Okay. So you would be notified that there would be a Grand Jury proceeding involving your investigation?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And do you recall if you testified before the Grand Jury in the state court proceeding?
- A. I'm pretty sure. You know, sometimes other detectives will fill in if you're absent that day.

But, you know, I don't remember testifying in the Grand Jury for this. But it just could be just, like, don't recall.

Q. And that's fair. I appreciate that.

So after the case gets going, at some point were you notified by the prosecutor's office that there's going to be a hearing on the defense's motion to suppress the evidence?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And would there have been some sort of prep session between you and the prosecutors to prepare for that suppression hearing?

- 23 A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recall any of that?
- 25 A. I do.

1 All right. And was that something where somebody Q. 2 would have called you from the prosecutor's office or 3 sent you an e-mail or something, requesting that you 4 come in for the session? 5 Like I said earlier, they may have sent me a Α. 6 subpoena or called us directly. 7 Okay. You're not sure which way it occurred? 8 Α. No. 9 Okay. But you do recall there was some sort of **Q**. 10 meeting? 11 Α. Yes. 12 And then you, of course, attend the suppression 0. 13 hearing itself? 14 Α. I did. 15 16 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 was marked 17 for purposes of identification.) 18 19 Mr. Yasenchack, handing you what's been marked as 20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, I will represent to you is a copy 21 of the docket from the state court proceeding, 22 captioned, State of Ohio, versus William Ellis. This is the 2019 case. 23 24 I believe I'm correct that the suppression 25 hearing was held some time in 2019.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Do you recall that?

- A. I don't recall that date but it does show it as August 23rd, I think.
- Q. Okay. And do you recall in that case that the state court judge ultimately determined that the evidence that had been collected from Mr. Ellis during the March 4, 2019 stop should be suppressed?
 - A. Do I remember that or?
 - O. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yeah. That was the ultimate decision.
- Q. And was that around September of 2019?
- 12 A. That, I don't know.
 - Q. I'm sorry, August 23, 2019?
 - A. That's when it was sent, the suppression.
 - Q. Well, am I correct that if you turn to the third page of Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, by the 8/23/19 docket entry, the Court indicated, "Defendant's Motion to Suppress, filed on 5/16/2019 is granted."
 - Do you see that?
- 20 A. Yep.
 - Q. I guess what I'm -- what I'd ask you is, were you notified by the prosecutor's office around that time that that had been the Court's ruling, was to suppress that evidence?

PH: 216.241.3918

25 A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

17

18

- Q. All right. Do you recall being informed at any time that the State Court ruling was to suppress that evidence?
 - A. I don't remember any notification.
- Q. Okay. Well would the prosecutor's office typically keep you apprised of developments of criminal cases where you were one of the detectives involved?
 - A. Sometimes.
- Q. Okay. Did you come to learn at any time that the prosecutor's office was trying to appeal that decision?
- 11 A. Yes.
 - Q. When did you become aware of that?
- 13 A. I don't know what date.
- Q. Okay. Would it have been in 2019 some time, to the best of your recollection?
- 16 A. No.
 - O. No it would not have been or --
 - A. It would not have been in 2019.
- 19 O. It would have been in 2020 some time?
- 20 A. I don't remember the date that --
- 21 Q. Okay.
- A. -- I eventually learned, but...
- Q. Let me ask you this: Would you have had a system
 of some sort, for your own benefit, of keeping track of
 active criminal prosecutions where you may have been a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

witness?

- A. Just the county website.
- Q. Okay. So let me understand what you mean by that. Would you go to the county court docket from time to time and check on criminal prosecutions that you knew you were involved in?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And what sort of system or practice did you have in place for monitoring those cases?
- A. You know, if I remembered that a case was coming up and I needed to see that the date as to a sentencing or motion to suppress, I would check it.
- Q. Let me ask you this: How many cases, active criminal prosecutions, would you typically be involved in at any given time?
 - A. Numerous.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. We were constantly getting complaints.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- A. We have cases that are going through the court
 system and then cases that we're actively investigating
 before arrest.
 - Q. Do you think at any give time during your time, and let's talk about this time, around 2019, that you would have had more than a dozen criminal prosecutions

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going on at a given time?

- A. Yes.
 - Q. So would those have all been in state court?
- A. Yeah. Only a handful of cases during this time period would -- were prosecuted through the federal system.
 - Q. Okay. And let me ask you this: Other than
 Cuyahoga County and the Federal District For the
 Northern District of Ohio, do you recall ever being
 involved in any criminal prosecutions outside those two
 venues, like, for instance, Summit County, Lake County,
 Lorain County?
- 13 A. I think we assisted Lake County Narcotics on a 14 case.
- 15 Q. Okay.
 - A. Or a few cases, yeah.
 - Q. In that situation, you might have been part of a multiple jurisdictional task force or something involved in the criminal prosecution?
 - A. No. I don't think we were involved in the task force. We were just -- since our district borders, you know, Euclid and then Lake County, we would help Lake County Narcotics during some of their investigations.
 - Q. Okay. To the best of your recollection, in those cases where you may have assisted Lake County or some

- other jurisdiction, would you have been considered a lead detective on that case?
 - A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And in those situations where you may have assisted another jurisdiction, such as Lake County, would you have been the officer to have brought the case to the local prosecutor?
- A. No.
- Q. You believe it was then some time in 2020 when you learned that the Court had ordered suppression of the evidence seized from Mr. Ellis during the March 4, 2019 traffic stop?
- A. The question is when I learned that the evidence was suppressed?
- 15 Q. Yes, sir.
- 16 A. I don't remember a date on that.
- Q. Okay. Do you remember how you came to learn that?
- A. I don't remember if it was the prosecutor that called, or I looked on the website, but -- I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. All right. So it could have been either one of those things, you could have been informed directly by the prosecutor's office, or you may have seen it in the course of going through active case

- dockets that you may have been involved with; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And did you come to learn that the State was actually going to move to dismiss the charges against Mr. Ellis in the State Court proceeding?
 - A. When did I learn, or whether --
 - Q. Did you come to learn that?
 - A. Probably just from seeing it on the website.
- Q. Okay. All right. So you'll see on Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, there's an entry on the docket for May 14, 2020, concerning the State's Motion to Dismiss the indictment as being granted.
 - Do you see that?
- 15 A. Yes.
 - Q. And the State had, in fact, filed a motion to dismiss the indictment the day before, on May 13, 2020?
 - A. Yeah. That's what it says right there.
 - Q. And you don't recall whether or not you saw either one of those entries or exactly when you saw either one of those entries; is that fair?
- 22 A. That's fair.
 - Q. Okay. And you are not sure how you came to be informed about either one of those actions by the prosecutor's office or the Court?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

- 1 A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. Now if we could go back to the Plaintiff's

 Exhibit 1, which is the Search Warrant Affidavit.

Am I correct, sir, that you began preparing this on a date earlier than May 14, 2020?

- A. Did I actually start writing this?
- O. Yes, sir.
 - A. Before May, no.
- Q. Before May 14th?
- 10 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall presenting a draft of this

 Search Warrant Affidavit to one of the city prosecutors

 prior to May 14th of 2020?
- A. Going back one question, I did draft this before May 14th.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall when?
 - A. No. But shortly before that date.
- Q. Could it have been a couple days before?
- 19 A. Yeah. I don't know. I don't remember.
- Q. Do you recall having one of the city prosecutors
 review the Search Warrant Affidavit prior to

- 22 | May 14, 2020?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Was that Gina Villa[spelling]?
- A. I don't remember who.

- 1 Now this Search Warrant Affidavit, Q. Okay. 2 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, am I correct, is the product of a 3 subsequent investigation that you conducted relative to 4 Mr. Ellis? 5 And by subsequent, I mean subsequent to the 6 March 4, 2019 traffic stop; is that fair? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Okay. And do you recall how you were assigned to 0. 9 perform that particular investigation that was used to 10 support this search warrant? 11 Whether I was assigned to it or -- what do you 12 mean by that? 13 Let me ask it this way: How did you become 14 tasked or responsible for a particular criminal 15 investigation? 16 There's quite a few avenues as to how we generate 17 cases. 18 0. Okay. 19 And this case, I had received information about
 - A. And this case, I had received information about someone selling drugs on that street.
 - Q. Well, yeah. Let's explore that a little bit and go through this.
 - The first contact you had with Mr. Ellis, back in March of 2019, was a result of a traffic stop, correct?

A. Yes.

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And were you, as you recall, were you just patrolling the area where that traffic stop occurred or were you conducting an investigation into potential criminal activity?
- A. I believe that there was complaints about drug activity in the East 200 area, up near the highway.
- Q. Okay. And, again, was that complaint brought to you directly or did somebody inform you within the department that "we have this complaint and need you to go and investigate"?
- A. I don't remember how I got that complaint. You know, it could have been someone calling the office, someone calling the Commander's office. Could have been someone coming to the lobby and giving information.

 There's quite a few ways that we receive complaints.
- Q. Okay. And I guess I'm just trying to understand that a little bit. If somebody would call in or walk into the Fifth District and complain about criminal activity in a particular area, and then would you be the one that takes the complaint or would somebody else take it and apprise you of it? How does that work?
- A. Probably one of the lobby office workers take that information and then convey it to the Vice Unit.
 - Q. Is that put on a form of some kind?
 - A. Normally, it's just sheet of paper that that

- 1 person writes on.
 - Q. Is it maintained in a file somewhere?
- 3 A. No.

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

25

- Q. Or once it's handed off to you, nobody keeps it?
- 5 A. Yeah.
 - Q. Okay. And is it just based upon the availability of detectives who picks up on that complaint and goes out to investigate?
- 9 A. Yes.
 - Q. So it's not necessarily a lieutenant or a supervising officer that is saying, "I want you to go out and perform this investigation"; is that fair?
- 13 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. So that's one of the ways.
 - And then with regards to the investigation that was conducted relative to the May 14, 2020 search warrant, you indicated that you had received some information; is that right?
- 19 A. I did.
- Q. Do you remember how you received that information?
- A. I made a traffic stop. And I received some information from the person I conducted the traffic stop on.

PH: 216.241.3918

Q. Okay. And do you recall when that was?

- 1 A. Just in April of 2020.
- Q. Okay. And do you recall who was involved in the traffic stop?
- 4 A. I do.
- 5 Q. Who was that?
- 6 A. Victor Payne.
- Q. Victor Payne?
- 8 A. P-A-Y-N-E.
- 9 Q. Okay. Did Mr. Payne receive some sort of traffic 10 citation?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. Do you remember anything about the stop?
- 13 A. I do.
- Q. What do you recall?
- A. I conducted a traffic stop when he was driving a motorcycle.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- 18 A. He pulled into a driveway off of 127th.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- A. I mentioned the possibility of, if he gave me information about the neighborhood, he wouldn't get a traffic violation, a traffic ticket.
- Q. Okay. So you told him, "In exchange for information about the neighborhood, I won't write you a ticket," something like that?

4

5

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

- 1 A. Something like that.
 - Q. Okay. And he gave you information?
- 3 A. He did.
 - Q. And what information do you recall him giving you?
- A. He pointed out -- discretely signaled the street, a house across the street that he noticed a large volume of white, Caucasian people were going to, staying a short period of time and leaving.
 - Q. And would it be fair to say that the house that he pointed out was ultimately determined to be the residence of William Ellis?
- 13 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And was there any sort of report that was made that went along with this traffic stop?
- 16 A. No.
 - Q. Okay. It's my understanding that you were wearing a wearable body camera system.
- 19 A. I was.
- Q. Okay. And that the camera captured the first part of the conversation; is that correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- Q. But did not capture the part of the conversation regarding Mr. Payne identifying Mr. Ellis's residence as a location where there was a lot of folks coming and

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

going; is that fair?

- A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. Was that intentionally not captured?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. So you would have turned the camera off?
- 6 A. I did.
 - Q. Okay. Now this interaction with Mr. Payne occurred in mid April of 2020; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And the activity that the investigation, if you will, that forms the basis for the Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, the Search Warrant Affidavit doesn't occur until on or about May 11th of 2020, correct?
 - A. Can you just say that question again?
 - Q. Yeah. The investigation that you subsequently conducted that formed the basis for your Search Warrant Affidavit, that investigation activity does not take place until approximately May 11th of 2020; is that correct?
- MR. RUSSELL: Objection.
- 21 Q. If you recall.
- 22 A. So you.
- Re -- I don't understand the question.
- Q. I'm just trying to ask you, you know, there was a time period between this traffic stop involving

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Mr. Payne and when you had went back out to investigate

 Mr. Ellis's residence on 127th Street, right?
 - A. The -- this investigation started when I got the information from Mr. Payne.
 - Q. Oh, okay. All right. What do you recall doing after you got the information from Mr. Payne?
 - A. I think I drove by the house a few times, trying to get license plate numbers.
 - Q. Okay. And do you recall when you did that?
- 10 A. No.
- Q. Would there be some record of when you did that?
- 12 A. No.
- Q. Okay. And do you recall if you were successful in capturing any license plate numbers when you drove past his house?
- 16 A. I don't remember.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall if you gathered any other significant information when you drove by Mr. Ellis's house on those occasions?
- A. You know, had I got any worthwhile information, I would have included that in the affidavit.
 - Q. Okay. All right. Well, let's move on to that. That helps.
 - Again, we've established that Plaintiff's Exhibit

 1 is the Search Warrant Affidavit that you signed on or

PH: 216.241.3918

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

- about May 14, 2020, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And you prepared this in anticipation of meeting with one of the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas judges to obtain a search warrant for Mr. Ellis's home, correct?
- A. Once I drafted this, I took it to a county judge, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And that was the purpose for drafting the search warrant, right -- or affidavit, was to ultimately ask for a search warrant, correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And in preparing this, you would have detailed the entirety of the investigation up to that point in time, correct?
 - A. I would have put pertinent information in the affidavit.
 - Q. Okay. And any material information, any important information that your investigation had gathered would have gone into this Search Warrant Affidavit, correct?
- A. Information that I thought -- well, that proved valuable, I would include in the affidavit.
 - Q. Okay. Because you understood -- look, when you wrote this affidavit, you had been on the force for, what, 22 years?

3

4

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

- 1 A. I would have to calculate that out.
 - Q. But you'd been on the force for quite a few years, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And you'd been a detective for a number of years, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
 - Q. And this wasn't the first time that you prepared a Search Warrant Affidavit?
- 10 A. No.
 - Q. Okay. And you understood that whatever judicial officer was reviewing this information would be relying upon this to determine whether or not there was probable cause to issue a search warrant, correct?
- 15 A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. So you would want to put in there anything that you thought might be of a value in helping the court officer to determine whether or not probable cause existed, right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now ultimately met with Cuyahoga County
 Common Pleas Judge Brian McCormick, right?

- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And you met with him on May 14th of 2020?
- A. Correct.

```
1
           You recall that?
       Q.
2
       Α.
           No.
                 I don't recall.
 3
                 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 was marked
4
5
                 for purposes of identification.)
 6
 7
           That's the date he signed it.
       Α.
8
           Mr. Yasenchack, handing you what's marked as
       0.
9
    Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 is Duty Report, dated 5/14/2020.
10
           And the first line at 0900 hours, JC -- which I
11
    assume stands for Justice Center?
12
       Α.
           Yes.
13
            -- Case Investigation SW signed by -- is that
14
    search warrant?
15
       Α.
           Correct.
16
            -- signed by Judge McCormick, right?
       0.
17
       Α.
           Correct.
18
           And does that refresh your recollection that you,
19
    in fact, met with Judge McCormick on May 14, 2020, to
20
    get that search warrant signed?
21
       Α.
           Yes.
22
                   And that's also the same day that the
23
    Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas dismissed the
24
    criminal charges against Mr. Ellis, relative to the 2019
25
    case, correct?
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

20

23

24

25

- 1 A. I was unaware of that at that time.
 - Q. Okay. So that's just coincidental, as far as you know, that those two things happened on the same day?
 - A. I had no knowledge of the suppression decision had occurred at this time, on that date.
 - Q. Okay. How often would you check the criminal dockets for the cases you were involved in while those cases were pending?
 - A. I -- it varied.
 - Q. You don't recall checking the criminal docket in 2019 case of Mr. Ellis at any time between August 2019 and May of 2020?
- 13 A. No.
 - Q. Kind of a long period of time for a criminal case, isn't it?
- 16 A. From what date?
 - Q. August 23rd of 2019 until May 14th of 2020?
- A. So the question is, had I checked the county site in between that time.
 - Q. Concerning that specific case, yes, sir.
- A. I probably checked. But not before I had this search warrant issued.
 - Q. Well, let me understand that. You are saying that you probably checked during that nine-month period?
 - A. On this date, when I had this signed, the last

- 1 | knowledge I had was that the State was appealing.
- Q. Okay. Let me understand that. When you had this search warrant signed on May 14th of 2020, you were aware that the State was appealing an order of the Common Pleas Court concerning the suppression of
- 7 A. Correct.

evidence?

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

25

- Q. So you would have been aware, one, that the evidence had, in fact, been suppressed by the State Court judge, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. And two, that the prosecutor's office had attempted to take a appeal of that issue to the 8th District Court of Appeals; is that fair?
- A. I knew that the event was suppressed and the State was planning to appeal.
 - Q. Okay. And well, in fact, had you come to learn now that the State did not file a timely appeal of the suppression ruling?
 - A. I know that.
- Q. In fact, they only had seven days from the date of the ruling to appeal to the 8th District Court of Appeals.

- Do you understand that?
 - A. That's probably why we are here today.

- 1 And the 8th District Court of Appeals Q. Okay. 2 dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction, on or 3 about April 20th of 2020; did you learn that? 4 That was due to the prosecutor not getting it in, 5 in time. 6 0. Yes. I agree. 7 Α. I'm aware of that now. 8 But you don't believe you were aware of that on 0. 9 May 14, 2020? 10 I know I wasn't. Α. 11 MR. RUSSELL: Objection. 12 All right. Did anybody else, other than 0. 13 yourself, participate in the meeting with Judge 14 McCormick on May 14, 2020? 15 Α. No. 16 Was that typical that you would go meet with the 0. 17 judge by yourself? 18 Α. Yes. 19 And meet in his chambers? 0. 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 2 3 ---
- Q. And did you provide the judge with any other information, other than what was contained in the Search Warrant Affidavit?

A. Normally, I would just provide him with the affidavit.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

- Q. Okay. So had you sought search warrants previously from Judge McCormick?
 - A. You know what? I'm not sure.
 - Q. Okay. All right. That's fair.

I guess what I'm trying to find out is, is there sort of a routine practice of how this operated with the Common Pleas judges? Would you kind of go in and say, "Judge, we're here for a warrant. And here's my affidavit."

Or did they kind of know why you were there?

- A. Yeah. You would advise the bailiff as to the reason why you were there.
- Q. Okay?
 - A. And they would accommodate you to see the judge.
- 15 Q. Okay.
 - A. But normally, I would go, I think it's to the 16th or 17th floor, where Judge Sheehan and Judge Corrigan, that was usually my go-to floor. They were the most available, usually.
 - Q. Okay. All right. I think Judge Sheehan was the Administrative Judge for a long time. I don't know if he still is, right?
- A. That was just recent, in the last couple of years.
 - Q. Okay. All right. I want to ask you about some

specific parts of the Search Warrant Affidavit.

So you begin with, on the first page, I believe, toward the bottom of the first page, the last few lines. You write, "Affiant has participated with other members of his unit in an ongoing investigation into the drug trafficking operations described below; Affiant has not always personally observed everything described below, but that he did not personally observe was described to him by other investigating officers who did."

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What other investigating officers did you participate with at this time, May 14, 2020, concerning this investigation?
- A. I do not recall if anyone assisted me on doing surveillance or checking the house for plates or anything.
- I may have asked somebody to, you know, check the house for license plate numbers. I don't recall.
- Q. Okay. So as you sit here today, you don't recall if there were actually any other law enforcement personnel who participated in this particular investigation, correct? At least not as of the date of this affidavit?
 - A. I don't remember if I had people assist me or

1 not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Okay. That's fine. Now on the next page, the location given is 638 East 127 Street in the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And I think we established that that was ultimately determined to be the residence of William Ellis, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. If we turn now to the third page of the Search Warrant Affidavit, in the first numbered paragraph, paragraph 1, you state, "Affiant averse that in mid April 2020 he received information from a concerned citizen about a black male residing at 638 East 127th Street selling drugs out of his house."

Do you see that?

- A. I do.
- Q. And I think we've already established that the concerned citizen was, in fact, somebody that you had stopped during a traffic stop, correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Victor Payne. And you had told Mr. Payne that he would not get a traffic citation if he had told you about criminal activity in the neighborhood; is that fair?

3

4

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

1 MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

- A. I had advised Mr. Payne if he supplied me information, I wouldn't write him a traffic ticket.
- Q. Well, the information you were looking for was on possibly criminal activity, correct?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. And specifically drug activity, correct?
- A. You know, at first, I think I -- I kind of asked

 him if there was anything happening in his neighborhood.

 And then -- then I asked if there was any drug

 complaints.
 - Q. Well, you weren't asking about block parties right? When you say "I was asking if anything going on in the neighborhood," you meant criminal activity, right?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. Now in paragraph 2, you state, "Affiant avers that in early May 2020, a confidential informant provided affiant of a black male know as, quote/unquote, 'Lays.'"
- 21 And give a physical description.
- Do you see that?
- 23 A. I do.
- Q. And is there anything that would pin the date down more than May of 2020, early May 2020?

- 1 A. No.
- Q. Okay. So you don't know what specific date you received that information?
- 4 A. Correct.
- Q. Do you know who the confidential informant was?
- 6 A. I do.

- Q. Who was that?
- 8 A. I'm unsure of his first name. It's either 9 Nathaniel or Nathan Write.
- Q. Nathan Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T?
- 11 A. (Indicating.) W-R-I-G-H-T, Wright.
- 12 Q. How did you come to meet with Mr. Wright?
- A. I don't recall if it was via text message or

 phone call. But I received most of this through text

 messages with Mr. Wright.
- Q. Okay. And how long had you worked with Mr. Wright?
- 18 A. I don't remember how long.
- Q. Okay. If this was received by a text message, would that have been to a city-issued phone that you had?

- 22 A. No.
- Q. Would it have been to a personal phone?
- 24 A. Correct.
- Q. What carrier would that have been with?

Α.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 Α. I do not remember who I had at that time. 2 changed carriers quite a few times. I don't remember. 3 Did you have a city-issued phone? 0.
 - Okay. And do you know what the phone number was? Q.
 - At that time? Α.
 - Yes, sir. 0.

No.

- I don't remember if it was my current number. Α. I don't remember.
- Okay. So it may or may not have been your current number?
- 12 Α. Correct.
- 13 MR. SCOTT: I don't want to put a phone number on the record. Maybe just give it to me later. 15 MR. RUSSELL: Okay.
 - Did you save this text message? Ο.
 - Α. Like, put it in a case file or something?
- 18 Yes, sir. 0.
- 19 Α. No.
 - Wouldn't that be important information to Ο. maintain in a case file?
 - I would have wrote the information that he gave Α. me with me on a note in the file.
 - So there should be a note in this investigation 0. file with this information, with the text message

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

17

18

19

25

information?

- A. You know, usually I keep a pad of paper with me while I'm out on the road, making notes. And I know I would have written it down on a pad of paper. I don't remember if I actually took that note and put it in the case file. But I definitely wrote it down on the notepad.
- Q. All right. So the paper may or may not be in the case file?
- 10 A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. And how did you know Nathan Wright?
- A. I think earlier, I think as a unit, we were
 hitting hot spots. And we made a traffic stop on

 Mr. Wright. And he was in possession of some narcotics,
 a small amount. And I was giving him the opportunity to
 supply information.
 - Q. Okay. So Mr. Wright would have been an individual who was providing information, rather than face criminal charges himself; is that fair?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And do you recall when you first encountered
 Mr. Wright?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. Would it have been shortly before May of 2020?

PH: 216.241.3918

A. I do not remember.

- Q. All right. And how did Mr. Wright know to reach out to you in May of 2020 with information of Mr. Ellis, if you know?
- A. You know, I think I advised him that had he received any information about drug activity that he would -- he should contact me.
- Q. Okay. Well, do you recall if you specifically reached out to him about Mr. Ellis or 628 East 127th Street?
- A. I don't know -- I don't remember how, if he contacted me or I contacted him. But I think he contacted me about the activity.
- Q. All right. Do you know one way or the other, as you sit here today, whether you contacted him first asking if he had any information?
 - A. I don't remember.
- Q. All right. Is that a possibility, that you contacted him first asking if he had any information?
- A. No. I don't think I would have asked him, "Hey, do you -- were you familiar about this house?"

 You know.
 - Q. I guess what I'm trying to say --
- A. I don't think I reached out to him. I wouldn't have done that. I wouldn't have asked an informant if they were aware of a house that we received a complaint

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- on. I don't see myself doing that.
 - Q. Okay. So you think it was just a coincidence that he happened to give you this information in May of 2020?
 - A. I just know that that's when he contacted me with that information.
 - Q. Okay. Now in the next paragraph, paragraph 3, you state, "Affiant arrested Ellis in 2019, having in his possession heroin, carfentanil, cocaine, and marijuana during a traffic stop. This case is open and currently in the Court of Appeals."
- Do you see that?
- 13 A. I do.
- Q. And we can agree that on May 14th of 2019, the criminal case, 2019 criminal case, was, in fact, dismissed, correct?
- 17 A. That's what the docket says.
- Q. Okay. And the appeal had been dismissed in April of 2020, correct?
- A. I don't know when that was. The entry of April 21 22nd?
- Q. Yes, sir.
- Is that correct?
- A. Yeah. That's what the docket shows.
- Q. Okay. And we can agree that your Search Warrant

1 Affidavit makes no mention of the fact that -- of the 2 Court's suppression ruling in the 2019 case, correct? 3 But I do mention that it was currently in 4 Appeals Court. 5 Okay. And actually, in fact, you know that it 6 was not, correct? 7 Α. Correct. 8 MR. RUSSELL: Objection. 9 On this date, May 14th of 2020? 0. 10 I now know that the prosecutor didn't get it in 11 on time. 12 Okay. All right. I want to go down to the next 0. 13 paragraph, please, number 4. 14 "Affiant avers that during the past 72 hours 15 affiant set up surveillance on 638 East 127th Street, 16 parens, the premises, end parentheses, period." 17 Do you see that? 18 I do. Α. 19 And just working backwards from the date Okay. 20 of this affidavit, would I be correct that the 72 hour 21 period would have begun on May 11th of 2020? 22 Α. Correct. 23 So if you are talking about 72 hours between Q. May 11, 2020 and May 14, 2020, correct? 24

PH: 216.241.3918

Α.

Correct.

25

1 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 was marked 2 3 for purposes of identification.) 4 5 Mr. Yasenchack, I'm going to hand you what we marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4. 6 7 Take a minute to familiarize yourself with that. 8 Mr. Yasenchack, you had a chance to review 4, 9 Plaintiff's Exhibit 4? 10 Α. Yes. 11 And am I correct, sir, this is a Departmental 12 Information Form that you would have completed on or 13 about May 20th of 2020? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And what was the purpose of this form? Why did 16 you prepare this? 17 This is just a Form One Report that would have Α. 18 accompanied the packet, the arrest packet, Grand Jury 19 packet. 20 Okay. So would you typically complete a Form 21 One, like this, prior to going to the prosecutor's 22 office with a packet for the prosecutor's office to 23 review? 24 Α. Yes. 25 And I take it you would not typically Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- complete this type of form earlier in your investigation just to keep the lieutenant or supervising officers apprised of your activities; is that fair?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Let me ask you this: Did you have any system for reviewing or keeping supervising officers apprized of investigation activity for all of your activities?
 - A. Did we have a system?
 - O. Yes, sir.
- 10 A. No.
 - Q. So was it just sort of ad hoc that you would go to a supervisor, maybe if you thought there was something of importance that they needed to know, or how would that work?
 - A. If I knew the information I was gathering was looking to result in an execution of a search warrant, I would give the details to a superior.
 - Q. Okay. And would you just go into their office and meet with them, or how would you get that information to the superior?
- A. Yeah. We would just meet at the office.
 - Q. Okay. And then, just looking at everything, were there rotating supervisors or did you have multiple supervisors during this period of time?
 - A. At this time our unit didn't have a direct

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- supervisor, Sergeant Kincaid, I can't remember if he
 just got another positions or he may have been promoted
 to lieutenant, and that was the reason why he left. But
 there was a time period where we didn't have a direct
 supervisor. And Lieutenant Gapente[spelling] and
 Captain Cane, you know, tried to fill in for him.
 - Q. Okay. And what was, as you understood, what was the role of the supervising officer relative to your individual case investigations?
 - A. What was their responsibilities, as to supervising me?
- 12 O. Yes, sir.
 - A. I think they were just supposed to keep apprise as to the status of our active cases.
 - Q. Okay. Well, were they there to, as you understood it, to provide guidance on how to provide the investigation?
 - A. Provide guidance? You know, Sergeant Kincaid, after a few years of being our supervisor, he understood how drug investigations occurred. Because I don't think he did, you know, drug investigations until he, you know, got into the sergeant of the Vice Unit. So he had, like, a learning period of how the cases were generated and stuff.

PH: 216.241.3918

And so after he learned the process, I would go

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

- to him for you know suggestions. And I definitely kept
 him apprised of my cases.
 - Q. Okay. And was that through the course of informal meetings? Or did you have a regular scheduled meeting with him?
 - A. Just informal meetings.
 - Q. If you catch him in the office?
- 8 A. Yes.
 - Q. To your knowledge, does the City of Cleveland
 Police Department have any policies that require
 supervising officers to review active ongoing criminal
 investigations?
- MR. RUSSELL: Objection.
- Q. To your knowledge?
 - A. Like, general police orders? I don't know.
 - Q. Okay. That's fair.
 - So as far as you knew, there was nothing that said you had to bring case file investigations to a supervising officer for review?
- MR. RUSSELL: Objection.
- Go ahead.
- Q. If you know.
- 23 A. I don't know.
- Q. Okay. All right. Okay. Looking at Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, the Form One, in the second paragraph, you

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

- indicate, "On May 11, 2020, I set up surveillance on 638
 East 127th Street," correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. And let me back up. That's fine.

 I haven't seen a duty report for May 11, 2020.
 - Do you know if one would have been completed?
 - A. I imagine so.
 - Q. Okay. Would that detail the time when you set up surveillance and when you stopped the surveillance on that day?
- A. I don't think I put, like, exact times. But it may. I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. Do you remember how long you conducted surveillance at that location on May 11, 2020?
 - A. I just remember it wasn't too long.
- Q. Okay. So you think less than an hour, more than an hour?
 - A. Definitely less than an hour. I would estimate between 15 minutes and half hour.
 - Q. Okay. And would you have been observing the residents from your vehicle or do you recall how you set up surveillance?

- 23 A. I was in a vehicle.
- Q. Okay. Parked near or across the street or something like that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

21

22

23

- 1 A. I wouldn't have parked across the street.
 - Q. But where you had view of the house?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What you described -- first of all, you described seeing a black Ford Explorer, correct?
 - A. Yeah. There was one parked in the street.
 - Q. Okay. And you ultimately determined that that vehicle was associated with Mr. Ellis; is that right?
 - A. Yes. I had earlier -- it had the same place of Henry, yesterday, Henry 8894.
 - Q. Okay. And before I forget, did any other law enforcement personnel participate in the investigation of May 11th, other than yourself?
- A. I don't know if, you know, I asked somebody to
 drive by the house or something. That's a possibility.

 But I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. So as you sit here today, you don't recall anybody else being involved in the surveillance of this location?
- 20 A. I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. All right. And then after the black Ford Explorer, you next describe a burgundy Dodge Magnum parked on the street?

- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And you see two white males exit and enter the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- accident residence of 638 East 127th Street, right?
- 2 A. Correct.
 - Q. At any time did you have any direct interaction with that vehicle or those two males?
 - A. No.
 - Q. So you never stopped them or questioned them or made any sort of search of their vehicle, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And you didn't gather any evidence directly from them, why they were there or what they were doing?
- 11 A. No.
- Q. All right. And why was that? Did you not -- did
 you not want to leave your post, where you were, or what
 was the thought process there?
- A. I think I was just waiting to see what the rate of activity was.
- Q. Okay. Now did you record it in any way? Did you film it?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Use your body cam?

 Did you have the ability to do that?
- A. I can't remember if our unit had a camcorder or not. I'm not sure.
- Q. In other investigations, would you have equipment available to you, whereby you could either photograph or

film this type of surveillance, to record the activity?

- A. I don't remember if we had a camcorder at that time. A lot of the times we have to report to our personal phones to photograph. So I'm not sure if we are -- our unit had a camcorder.
- Q. Do you recall in any of your earlier investigations using a camcorder or any type of recording device to record this type of surveillance?
- A. There was a couple of cases where I had a camcorder, I think the unit had one, and I used it during a couple of cases.
- Q. Okay. You would agree that that's strong evidence that could potentially be used in court if you are trying to establish that a certain activity occurred during an investigation?
- A. Just a video of showing the volume of possibly drug buyers going through and from a house.
 - Q. That would be one evidentiary value, correct?
- A. Seeing the video of people going into a house and leaving may -- may be -- you know, the recovery of the drugs from the occupants, I think that that's strong evidence of...
- Q. Well, if you wanted to establish specific people were at that location, that would certainly be, a video or photograph would certainly be strong evidence that

PH: 216.241.3918

- they were, in fact, at that location, isn't it?
- A. From the distance I was at, a photo wouldn't have
- 3 been...

4

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

- Q. Well, how far away do you think you were?
- A. I was a good distance. I'm using high-powered binoculars to see the activity.
 - Q. Were you a couple of houses down the street or were you on a different block?
 - A. More than a few houses.
 - Q. More than a few houses? So you are observing this from more than a few houses away?
- 12 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. Again, do you have any idea of the total distance you were from this house?
- 15 A. No.
- Q. You next describe a blue Saturn that parks on the street and a white female exits.
- Do you see that?
- 19 A. I do.
- Q. And she ultimately enters the house, correct?
- 21 A. She does.
- Q. And it looks like at about the same time, a white vehicle pulls up into the driveway; is that right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So what you describe in paragraph four is

- 1 the black Ford Explorer that's associated with William
- 2 | Ellis, and a total of three vehicles that come to the
- 3 house and subsequently leave, correct?
- 4 A. Yep.
- 5 Q. And there's a total of five individuals
- 6 associated with those three vehicles, correct?
- 7 A. Yep.
- Q. You have no interaction with the two white males
- 9 in the burgundy Dodge Magnum, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. You do stop the white female in the blue Saturn,
- 12 | correct?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. Oh, you do not? Do you have any interaction with
- 15 | her?
- 16 A. No.
- Q. Okay. And you collect no evidence from her,
- 18 | correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- Q. You stop the white vehicle with two individuals,
- I believe it turns out to be a male and female, correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And that's described in Judge Pearson's
- order. As Matthew Radovanic and Vanessa Smith; is that

PH: 216.241.3918

25 right?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 A. Those were the two individuals that I stopped.
 - Q. Okay. And you say that those two individuals became confidential informants, right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. All right. And were any criminal charges pressed against those two individuals?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did you find evidence of criminal activity that would have supported criminal charges for either of those individuals?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. That would have been drug possession, something like that?
- 14 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. So what you are telling me is that in exchange for not being charged criminally, these individuals agreed to be confidential informants correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And the information that they provided, would they have provided it then on scene when you interacted with them on May 11, 2020?
 - A. Yeah. During the stop, I would have collected some information. I don't remember if they came back to the district and I conducted a more thorough interview

- with them. But Matthew eventually came to my office and had more and I received further information from him.
 - Q. Okay. So you recall meeting at least with Matthew Radovanic some time after May 11th to gather additional information from him?
 - A. Some time after the stop. It might have been about that same day that he came back to the office or, you know, another day.
 - Q. But Vanessa Smith, you do not recall her coming to the office?
 - A. I don't remember if she came or not.
 - Q. Okay. And would there have been a reason why she would not have come or been required to come?
 - A. I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. Do you recall anyone else participating in the office interviews of either of those individuals?
- A. I don't recall if anybody else was in the office.

 Chances are there were more people there, but I don't

 remember.
 - Q. Okay. And did they give any sort of recorded or written statement?
- 22 A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

25

- Q. Is there a reason why it wasn't recorded or in writing?
 - A. I just probably took notes as to the information

- 1 | they supplied.
- Q. Again, would those notes be in the investigative file?
- 4 A. Possibly.
- Q. Okay. You wouldn't necessarily always put your notes in the investigative file?
 - A. Sometimes I would.
- Q. Okay. But I take it that sometimes you would not?
- 10 A. Correct.

- Q. Okay. To your knowledge was there any sort of
 departmental policy that would have required a statement
 like this from a confidential informant to be either
 written or recorded somehow?
- MR. RUSSELL: Objection.
- Go ahead.
- 17 A. No.
- Q. No, there was not a policy; or no, you were not aware of one?
- A. I was not aware of any policy.
- Q. Okay. So I take it, it was not a practice,

 certainly not a practice of yours, to record statements

 of confidential informants like this?
- A. Correct.
- Q. To your knowledge, did any other detectives in

1	the Fi	fth District Detective Bureau record statements
2	from co	onfidential informants?
3		MR. RUSSELL: Objection.
4	Q.	If you know.
5	А.	In my unit or the Detective Bureau?
6	Q.	In your unit.
7	А.	You stated Detective Bureau.
8	Q.	Am I saying it wrong?
9	А.	I'm in the Vice Unit.
10	Q.	The Vice Unit.
11	А.	No. I was unaware of anybody else that would
12	record	interviews with informants.
13	Q.	Okay. So you are not aware of any other
14	detect:	ives in the Vice Unit that would record
15	confide	ential informants' statements?
16	А.	Correct.
17	Q.	And you would agree though that it would be
18	benefic	cial if those were recorded statements in a
19	subseq	uent prosecution?
20	А.	They a recording of that may have some value.
21	But it	also there's an also a record there then of
22	that pe	erson supplying me information.
23		You know, I do have a duty to help protect
24	informa	ants that give me information. A lot of

informants are worried about their safety when supplying

PH: 216.241.3918

25

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- this information. That they are often worried that that information will come back to the drug dealer and harm may come to them.
 - Q. Well, certainly in a case like this, I mean, all of these individuals were ultimately identified in court and the court proceedings, right?
 - A. I know that now.
 - Q. Okay. Now I know there was a search warrant was issued, correct?
- 10 A. Yep.
- Q. And a search of Mr. Ellis's home was conducted, right?
- 13 A. Correct.
 - Q. And you participated in that, together with a number of other law enforcement officers; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. To your knowledge, was there -- when you went to get the search warrant from Judge McCormick was there any -- to your knowledge, was there any other law enforcement agency investigating Mr. Ellis?
- 21 A. No.
 - Q. And to your knowledge, no other law enforcement agency was seeking a search warrant of Mr. Ellis's home at that time?

PH: 216.241.3918

A. I had no knowledge of that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

19

20

- Q. Okay. And certainly it was your expectation that upon execution of the search warrant that you would find evidence of criminal activity and criminal charges would be brought against Mr. Ellis; is that fair?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And now in this case, after the search of Mr. Ellis's home, you did not lead the subsequent criminal case, correct? You're not the one that brought it to the prosecutor's office?
- 10 A. Correct.
 - Q. And that was another -- is he a member of the Cleveland Police Department, Kopchak? Is a he a member of Cleveland --
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Oaky. And is it your understanding that Kopchak brought the case to a federal prosecutor; is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you know why he went to a federal prosecutor and not a state prosecutor?
- A. He is a -- what is his title?
- He's a member of a task force. I think he's with
 the ATF. And one of his roles is to examine cases that
 kind of fit the federal requirement for prosecution.
- 25 And, you know, even if zone-car patrolman made arrests,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

- like gun arrests, he would evaluate the case and
 prosecutor cases that he deemed -- that had all the
 elements to charge him federally.
 - Q. Okay. Well, you had participated in federal prosecutions before, correct?
 - A. Prosecutions?
 - O. Yes, sir.
 - A. No. There's usually a detective that, other than myself, that handled all that. I never presented a case federally.
 - Q. Okay. You may have been a witness in a case but you never presented one to a prosecuting attorney; is that fair?
- 14 A. Yes.
 - Q. But up to this point in time, you had certainly been the lead investigator at this point in time being when you prepared the Search Warrant Affidavit and obtained the search warrant, you would been the lead investigator, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And maybe the only investigator, correct?
- A. No. At that point, we had a number of assisting detectives that helped during the search warrant.

- Q. Well, I understand that.
- A. But I was the only lead.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. But up to May 14, 2020, when you obtained the search warrant, up to that point in time, you were really the only investigator actively involved in the case, correct?

MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

- A. I may have had detectives assist with doing some surveillance.
 - Q. You don't recall one way or another?
- 9 A. No.
 - Q. Okay. So why was the investigation or the responsibility for presenting the case to the prosecutor handed off to Officer Kopchak?

MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

Go ahead.

- A. I assume that Detective Kopchak thought that the case met the standards to present it federally.
- Q. Okay. Well, certainly, you had the ability to present the case to a state prosecutor, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So how was this determination made that you would not go to a state prosecution, but Officer Kopchak go to a federal prosecutor?
- A. I think Kopchak, because of his task force with the ATF, and he emphasized gun cases, and there was a qun recovered from Mr. Ellis's residence, that there was

```
1
    an emphasis for him to present weapon cases federally.
2
    So he thought that this case --
 3
           Well, did Officer Kopchak outrank you?
       0.
4
       Α.
           No.
5
           Was there discussion between you and Officer
6
    Kopchak about how the case would proceed following the
7
    search of Mr. Ellis's residence?
8
           You know, Detective Kopchak assisted on the
       Α.
9
    search warrant. And he was aware of the gun being
10
    recovered and drugs being recovered, so he may have -- I
11
    don't know if we had talked or he just deemed that,
12
    "Hey, I'm going to take this case and charge it
13
    federally."
14
           Well, were you reluctant to go back to state
       0.
15
    court, given what happened with the 2019 case?
16
       Α.
           No.
17
                 MR. RUSSELL: Do you have; is this a good
18
    time to take a short break.
19
20
                 (Off the record.)
21
22
    BY MR. SCOTT:
23
           So when your affidavit in paragraph four refers
       0.
24
    to during the past 72 hours the affiant set up
25
    surveillance at 628 East 127th Street.
                                              You told me
```

```
1
    about the, I think you described it as the 15 or 20
2
    minutes you were there on May 11, 2020, correct?
3
       Α.
           Correct.
4
           Okay. And do you recall returning to that
       Q.
5
    location at any time after May 11, 2020, but prior to
6
    May 14th of 2020?
7
           I don't remember distinctly doing that it, but I
8
    probably did further surveillance after that. At the
9
    very least, checking to see if the car was still there,
10
    like, especially the morning of or the night before the
11
    search warrant was executed.
12
13
                 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 was marked
14
                 for purposes of identification.)
15
16
           Let me hand you what we've marked as Plaintiff's
17
    Exhibit 5. And that's a one page document.
18
                 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 was marked
19
20
                 for purposes of identification.)
21
           And here's Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, which is
22
23
    another one page document.
24
           Plaintiff's Exhibits 5 and 6 are Duty Reports.
    And I believe Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 is the Duty Report
25
```

- 1 for May 12, 2020; is that correct?
- 2 A. Yes.

- Q. And Exhibit 6 is the Duty Report for
- 4 May 13, 2020?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. Is there anything on Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 that suggests additional surveillance of Mr. Ellis's
- 8 residence?
- 9 A. Brackland is very close to this -- the house of
- 10 Mr. Ellis. I may have stopped, drove by the house on
- 11 Tuesday, during that surveillance. But I don't
- 12 remember.
- 0. Okay. Do you recall, as you sit here today,
- 14 whether or not the case invest that's referenced next to
- 15 the Brackland entry on Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, was that a
- 16 | separate investigation from --
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. But you believe in the same general area;
- 19 is that correct?
- A. Yeah. It's very close to Mr. Ellis's house.
- Q. Okay. And then as regards to Plaintiff's Exhibit

- 22 6, the Duty Report for May 13, 2020, is there anything
- 23 on there that suggests additional surveillance on
- 24 Mr. Ellis's residence?
- A. Yes. The second line, East 127 and Shaw.

- Q. Okay. Very good. And now there's no times
 indicated. Do you have any recollection as to how long
 you would have observed the residence on May 13th of
 2020?
 - A. No.

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. Do you think it might have just been a drive-by to see if the vehicle was still there?
 - A. I don't remember.
- Q. Okay. Would there be notes or something in the investigation file that would tell us that?
- 11 A. Possibly.
- Q. Okay. Is that something, typically, you would have made notes about?
- 14 A. Sometimes.
 - Q. Okay. Mr. Yasenchack, do you recall being involved in a criminal prosecution captioned, State of Ohio, versus Clyde Woods, in 2012?
- 18 A. Vaquely.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall that there was a suppression issue in that criminal proceeding, requesting the suppression of evidence?
- A. Vaguely.
- Q. Okay. And do you recall that you were directly involved as one of the investigators in that particular criminal prosecution?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. I think at the time Donald Kopchak and I were patrolmen.
 - Q. Okay. Is this the same Kopchak that was involved in the federal prosecution of Mr. Ellis?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. All right. So you two had been on the force together for some time?
 - A. Yeah. At that time, he probably only had a few years, Donald.
 - Q. Okay. And do you recall evidence being suppressed based upon the Trial Court's conclusion, that the justification for the search was pretextual?
 - A. I vaguely remember that that judge didn't think we could pace a car for speed, as being the reason why she suppressed the evidence.
 - Q. Okay. Well, do you recall if the justification for searching the vehicle was an inventory search or something like that?
 - A. I don't remember.
 - Q. Okay. You do recall though that the judge suppressed the evidence that was gathered during that stop?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And do you recall that the suppression decision in the Clyde Woods, Jr. case from 2012 was appealed to

2

3

4

5

7

8

```
the 8th District Court of Appeals?
```

- A. No.
 - Q. Okay. Are you aware -- do you have any recollection of the Court of Appeals upholding that decision?
- 6 A. No.
 - Q. Okay. Do you remember what your duty assignment was in 2012 relative to that criminal case?
- 9 A. I don't know if we were on patrol or in the CSU

 10 Unit. I don't remember.
- 11 | - -
- 12 (Thereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 was marked for purposes of identification.)
- 14
- Q. Mr. Yasenchack, I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 7, which is an opinion from the 8th District Court of Appeals, regarding the Clyde Woods, Jr. criminal prosecution. And I mean, you can familiarize yourself with it. But let me ask you this: Do you know or do you recall, as you sit here today, whether or not you've seen this opinion before?
 - A. I do not think so.
 - Q. Okay. All right. That's fine. If you turn to the second to the last page, there is lines that have been written on there. And there's a sentence at the

PH: 216.241.3918

22

23

24

25

1 bottom of the first paragraph. 2 "This is a classic example of a police officer's 3 intentional use of an unlawful traffic stop. Under a 4 questionable codified ordinance for the sole purpose of 5 conducting a fishing expedition for evidence of another 6 crime and a tailored script at the motion to suppress 7 hearing to justify the stop and subsequent searches." 8 Do you see that? 9 MR. RUSSELL: Objection. 10 Go ahead. 11 I see that. Α. 12 Does that refresh your recollection as to 0. 13 why the evidence was suppressed in the Clyde Woods case? 14 MR. RUSSELL: Objection. 15 Go ahead. 16 Α. No. 17 To your knowledge, did the City of 0. 18 Cleveland conduct any sort of review or impose any sort 19 of discipline for either you or Officer Kopchak as a 20 result of the suppression of evidence in the Clyde Woods 21 case? 22 MR. RUSSELL: Objection. 23 Go ahead. 24 Am I aware of any discipline resulting in

PH: 216.241.3918

evidence being suppressed?

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Yes, sir. Did anybody review this and call you and/or Officer Kopchak into the office and offer any sort of discipline or re-instruction, or anything like that?
 - A. This was 11 years ago.
 - Q. I appreciate that.
 - A. I don't remember.
- Q. Okay. To your knowledge, sir, was there any requirement for you to advise a court in any sort of subsequent requests for warrants or in subsequent affidavits of any history where your credibility had been called into question?
 - MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

Go ahead.

- A. Could you repeat that question again?
- O. Sure.

To your knowledge, was there any requirement that you advise any judicial officer, whether it be in a search warrant application or otherwise, of a prior situation where your ability would have been called into question?

- A. No.
- Q. And certainly, we can agree that the fact that you had previously been an investigating officer in a criminal matter where evidence was suppressed because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

21

22

23

your credibility was questioned, was not part of your Search Warrant Affidavit on May 14, 2020, right?

MR. RUSSELL: Objection.

Go ahead.

- A. You are saying that I didn't mention it in my affidavit?
 - O. Yes, sir.
- A. I just mentioned that the case was open and currently in appeals.
- Q. Correct. There is no reference to the fact that evidence was suppressed or that your credibility was in any way questioned, correct?
- A. I did put in that is it was open and currently in Appeals Court.
 - Q. All right. And you are aware, as you sit here today, that the federal case against Mr. Ellis was ultimately dismissed, correct?
- A. Yeah. I am aware that the confidential informants lied in federal court to get the charges dismissed.
 - Q. So you are aware that the confident informants did not testify consistent with what was represented in the Search Warrant Affidavit, correct?

PH: 216.241.3918

A. I am aware that the informants recanted their testimony that they supplied in federal court.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

23

24

- Q. Again, if we had a recording of some kind of the information they gave you, there would be a way of demonstrating clearly that their testimony in court was different than what they told you?
- A. Matthew Radovanic, I think is his name, admitted to Internal Affairs Sergeant Sheehan that the information he supplied during federal court was inaccurate, and that he lied. And that they the information I put in the affidavit was correct.
 - Q. Okay. Is that a recorded statement somewhere?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And it's not just the officer's summary,

 it's what Mr. Radovanic stated?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. All right. And you believe that's in his
 OPS interview?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. But at least as to what he testified under oath in court was different than what was reflected in the Search Warrant Affidavit?

- A. I am aware that he provided false information during a federal court proceedings.
 - Q. That was different than what was in your affidavit?
- 25 A. False information.

1 Have you ever spoken to Mr. Radovanic Q. Okay. 2 directly since the federal criminal charges against 3 Mr. Ellis were dismissed? 4 Α. No. 5 Did you make any effort to speak with either him 6 or Vanessa Smith after the Federal Court Franks hearing? 7 Α. No. 8 And I take it you did not participate in the 0. 9 Franks hearing? 10 Α. No. 11 In fact, did you participate in the actual 0. 12 federal criminal prosecution at all? 13 Α. No. 14 So you didn't meet with the prosecutor or didn't 0. 15 testify for the Grand Jury and weren't a witness in the 16 case? 17 Α. I had a quick conversation over the phone with 18 the prosecutor. That was it. 19 They were just mainly coordinating with 20 Officer Kopchak, right? 21 Α. Correct.

Was there any discussion between you and Officer

prosecution that the District Attorney's Office would be

moving to dismiss the charges against Mr. Ellis once the

PH: 216.241.3918

Kopchak or anyone else involved in the federal

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

evidence had been suppressed?

- A. No.
- Q. Is it your understanding that the criminal charges though were ultimately dismissed based upon the request of the District Attorney's Office to dismiss those charges?
- A. Due to the informants providing false testimony, ves.
 - MR. SCOTT: Mr. Yasenchack, I believe those are all of the questions I have for you today. I want to thank you for coming here today and giving me the opportunity to speak with you.
- And I believe your counsel will tell you about your right --
- MR. RUSSELL: Yeah. You have the right to review the transcript in advance of it being kind of formalized, or you can waive signature. It's entirely your choice.
- But if you ask to review, it will be
 prepared. You will have a chance to sit down and review
 the transcript and make sure it's accurate.
- THE WITNESS: Sure. Sure.
- MR. RUSSELL: We'll review.
- MR. SCOTT: Thank you so much.
- 25 _ _ _ _ _

1	(Deposition concluded at 11:56 a.m.)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PH: 216.241.3918

CERTIFICATE
I, Denise Cardona, a Notary Public within and for
the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that I attended the
foregoing hearing in its entirety, that I wrote the same
in stenotypy, and that this is a true and correct
transcript of my stenotype notes.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
and seal of office, at Cleveland, Ohio, this 8th day
of August A.D. 2023.
Denise Cardona
Denise Cardona, Notary Public, State of Ohio
1020 Ohio Savings Plaza, 1801 East 9th Street,
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
My commission expires November 29, 2026.

WORD INDEX

< 0 >**0900** 29:10

<1> **1** 3:9 7:13, 18, 23 19:3 20:2 25:12 26:25 35:12

1:22-CV-00815 1:9 **10:00** 1:2*1*

1020 74:19 **106** 2:15

11 42:24 47:1, 5, 14 53:22 62:2, 5 68:5

11:56 73:*1*

11th 25:13, 18 42:21

48:13 54:4 **12** 63:*1*

12/16 3:11

127 35:3 63:25 **127th** 23:18 26:2 35:14

40:8 42:15 47:2 49:1 61:25

13 18:*17* 63:*4*, 22

13th 64:3

14 1:22 7:7 18:12 19:5, 22 22:16 27:1 29:19 32:9, 14 34:13 42:24

60:1 69:2

14th 7:25 19:9, 13, 15 28:24 30:17 31:3 41:14

42:9 62:6

15 47:19 62:1 16th 33:17

17th 33:17

1801 74:19

1900 1:21 2:6

< 2 >

2 3:11 12:16, 20 13:16 18:11 36:17

20 62:*1*

200 21:6

2012 64:*17* 65:*25* 66:*8* **2019** 6:25 8:8, 10, 12, 14,

25 10:6, 12 12:23, 25 13:7, 11, 13 14:14, 18

15:24 17:12 20:6, 24 29:24 30:11, 17 41:8, 14, 15 42:2 61:15

2020 7:7, 25 14:19 17:9 18:12, 17 19:5, 13, 22 22:16 23:1 25:8, 13, 18

27:1 28:24 29:19 30:12, *17* 31:*3* 32:*3*, *9*, *14* 34:*13* 35:13 36:18, 25 39:24 40:2 41:4, 19 42:9, 21, 24

43:13 47:1, 5, 14 53:22 60:1 62:2, 5, 6 63:1, 4, 22

64:4 69:2

2023 1:22 74:*1*2

2026 74:21

20th 32:3 43:13

216-644-276712 2:*17*

216-650-3318 2:8

22 27:25

22nd 41:21

23 13:*13*

23rd 13:3 30:17

29 74:21 **29/4** 3:12

< 3 >

3 3:12 29:4, 9 41:7

<4>

4 3:13 8:14, 25 13:7 17:12 20:6 42:13 43:2, 6,

8, 9 46:25

4/6 3:4 **43/2** 3:13

44113 2:7

44114 2:16 74:20

4th 6:25 8:10

< 5 >

5 3:14 62:13, 17, 24, 25

63:6, 15

5/14/2020 29:9 **5/16/2019** 13:18

50 1:20 2:6

< 6 >

6 3:15 62:19, 22, 24 63:3,

22

62/13 3:*14*

62/19 3:15

628 40:8 61:25

638 35:3, 14 42:15 47:1

49:*1*

66/12 3:16

<7>

7 3:16 66:12, 16 7/13 3:9

72 42:14, 20, 23 61:24

< 8 >

8/23/19 13:16

8894 48:*10*

8th 31:13, 22 32:1 66:1, 17 74:11

<9>

9601 2:15 9th 74:19

< A >

A.D 74:12 **a.m** 1:21 73:1

ability 5:9 49:21 60:17

68:20

absent 11:10

accident 4:21, 23 49:1

accommodate 33:14 accompanied 43:18

accurate 72:21

actions 18:24

active 14:25 15:13 17:25 45:14 46:11

actively 15:21 60:3

activities 44:3, 7 activity 21:4, 6, 19 25:10,

17 35:24 36:5, 7, 14 40:5, 12 44:7 49:16 50:1, 14 51:6 53:8 58:3

actual 71:11

ad 44:11

additional 54:5 63:7, 23

Administrative 33:21 admitted 70:5

advance 72:16

advise 33:11 68:9, 18

advised 36:2 40:4 Affairs 70:6

Affiant 34:4, 6 35:12 36:17, 19 41:8 42:14, 15

61:24

Affidavit 3:9 7:6, 24 19:3, 12, 21 20:1 25:12,

17 26:21, 25 27:9, 16, 20, 22, 24 28:9 32:23, 25

33:9 34:1, 24 35:11 42:1,

20 59:17 61:23 69:2, 6, 23 70:9, 20, 24

affidavits 68:11

age 4:3

agency 57:20, 23 ago 4:21 68:5

agree 8:23 32:6 41:14, 25 50:12 56:17 68:23

agreed 53:17

ahead 8:16 9:6 46:21 55:16 60:14 67:10, 15, 23

68:14 69:4

al 1:12 4:10 allegations 4:16

amount 39:15 and/or 1:22 68:2

answer 5:8, 14

anticipation 27:3 anybody 32:12 48:18

54:17 56:11 68:1 appeal 14:10 31:13, 16,

18, 22 32:2 41:18 appealed 65:25

appealing 31:1, 4

PH: 216.241.3918

Appeals 31:14, 23 32:1 41:11 42:4 66:1, 4, 17 69:9, 14

APPEARANCES 2:1 application 68:19

appreciate 4:25 5:12 11:14 68:6

apprise 21:21 45:13 apprised 14:6 44:3 46:2

apprized 44:6 appropriate 5:2

approximately 25:18 **April** 23:1 25:8 32:3

35:13 41:18, 20 area 21:2, 6, 19 63:18

arose 7:2

arrest 15:22 43:18 arrested 41:8

arrests 58:25 59:1

asked 4:14 34:18 36:8, 10 40:19, 24 48:14

asking 5:4 36:12, 13 40:15, 18

asserted 4:16 assigned 20:8, 11

assignment 6:4 66:7

assist 34:25 60:6 assisted 16:13, 25 17:5

34:15 61:8 assisting 59:22

associated 48:8 52:1, 6 assume 5:7 29:11 60:15

ATF 58:23 60:24

attempted 31:13 attend 12:12

attended 74:6

attorney 59:12 **Attorney's** 71:24 72:5

August 13:3, 13 30:11, 17 74:12

availability 22:6 available 33:19 49:25

Avenue 2:15 avenues 20:16

avers 36:18 42:14 averse 35:12

aware 14:12 31:4, 8 32:7, 8 40:25 55:19, 20 56:13 61:9 66:3 67:24

69:15, 18, 21, 24 70:21

< B >

back 19:2, 14 20:23 26:1 47:4 53:24 54:7 57:2

61:14 backwards 42:19

bailiff 33:11 based 22:6 65:11 72:4

basis 9:2 25:11, 16

began 19:4 begun 42:21 behalf 2:2, 10 believe 12:24 17:9 21:5 32:8 34:2 52:21 62:25 63:18 70:15 72:9, 13 beneficial 56:18 **benefit** 14:24 best 5:8 14:15 16:24 binoculars 51:6 **bit** 5:1 20:21 21:17 black 35:14 36:19 48:5, 21 52:1 block 36:12 51:8 **blue** 51:16 52:11 **body** 24:18 49:20 **borders** 16:21 **bottom** 34:3 67:1 **Brackland** 63:9, 15 break 5:12, 13, 14 61:18 **Brian** 28:22 **bring** 46:18 brought 17:6 21:7 58:4, 8, 16 Bureau 56:1, 5, 7 burgundy 48:22 52:9 **buyers** 50:17

< C > calculate 28:1 call 9:25 21:17 37:14 68:*1* called 12:2, 6 17:20 68:12, 20 calling 21:12, 13 cam 49:20 camcorder 49:22 50:2, 5, 7, 10 camera 24:18, 20 25:5 Cane 45:6 Captain 45:6 captioned 12:22 64:16 **capture** 24:23 captured 24:20 25:3 capturing 26:14 car 62:9 65:14 Cardona 1:18 74:5, 18 carfentanil 41:9 **CARLI** 2:*12* carrier 37:25 carriers 38:2 **CASE** 1:9 3:11 4:10 8:8, 12, 18 9:11, 24 10:13, *14*, *15*, *17*, *19* 11:*1*, *15* 12:23 13:4 15:10 16:14 17:2, 6, 25 20:19 29:13, 25 30:11, 15, 20 38:17, 21 39:6, 9 41:10, 15 42:2 45:9 46:18 57:4 58:6, 8, 16 59:1, 9, 11 60:4, 11, 16,

18 61:2, 6, 12, 15 63:14 65:25 66:8 67:13, 21 69:8, 16 71:16 cases 6:19 14:7 15:9, 13, 20, 21 16:4, 16, 25 20:17 30:7, 8 45:14, 23 46:2 50:9, 11 58:23 59:2 60:24 61:1 catch 46:7 Caucasian 24:8 cause 28:14, 19 Center 29:11 certain 50:14 certainly 5:2 50:24, 25 55:22 57:4 58:1 59:15 60:17 68:23 certify 74:6 chambers 32:19 chance 43:8 72:20 **Chances** 54:18 changed 38:2 **charge** 59:3 61:12 charged 53:16 **charges** 18:5 29:24 39:19 53:5, 9 58:3 69:19 71:2, 25 72:4, 6 check 15:5, 12 30:6 34:18 checked 30:18, 21, 24 checking 30:10 34:16 62:9 **choice** 72:18 citation 23:10 35:23 citizen 35:14, 19 City 2:13 5:21 6:3 19:12, 20 35:3 46:9 67:17 **city-issued** 37:20 38:3 civil 4:20 classic 67:2 clear 5:5 clearly 70:3 Cleveland 1:21 2:7, 13, 16 5:21 6:4 35:4 46:9 58:12, 13 67:18 74:11, 20 **close** 6:11 10:1 63:9, 20 Clvde 64:17 65:25 66:18 67:13, 20 cocaine 41:9 codified 67:4 coincidence 41:2 coincidental 30:2 collect 52:17 collected 8:14, 25 13:6 53:23 come 4:14 9:25 12:4 14:9 18:4, 8 31:17 37:12 52:2 54:13 57:2, 3

coming 15:10 21:14

PH: 216.241.3918

24:25 54:9 72:11 Commander's 21:13 commission 74:21 **Common** 8:6 27:4 28:22 29:23 31:5 33:7 complain 21:18 complaint 4:15, 16 21:7, 9, 11, 20 22:7 40:25 complaints 15:18 21:5, 15 36:11 **complete** 43:20 44:1 **completed** 43:12 47:6 concerned 35:13, 19 **concerning** 8:*13* 18:*12* 30:20 31:5 34:13 concluded 73:1 **conclusion** 9:3 65:11 **conduct** 67:18 conducted 20:3 22:16, 23 23:15 25:16 47:13 53:25 57:11 **conducting** 21:*3* 67:*5* confident 69:21 **confidential** 36:18 37:5 53:3, 17 55:13, 23 56:2, 15 69:18 considered 17:1 consistent 69:22 constantly 15:18 contact 10:13 20:23 40:6 contacted 40:11, 12, 14, 18 41:5 contained 32:22 **conversation** 24:21, 23 71:17 **convey** 21:23 coordinating 71:19 **copy** 7:24 12:20 correct 4:17 5:22 6:5, 6, 17, 25 7:1, 4 8:3, 6, 10, 12, 25 10:16 12:24 13:15 19:1, 4 20:2, 24 24:21, 22 25:2, 13, 19 27:1, 2, 5, 10, 14, 20 28:6, 14, 15, 25 29:15, 17, 25 31:7, 10 34:23 35:4, 8, 9, 20 36:5, 7 37:4, 24 38:12 39:10 41:16, 19, 23 42:2, 6, 7, 20, 22, 24, 25 43:11 44:4 47:2, 3 48:5 49:2, 7, 8 50:18 51:20 52:3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 21 53:18, 19 55:10, 24 56:16 57:9, 13 58:8, 10, 17 59:5, 19, 21 60:4, 18 62:2, 3 63:1, 19 69:10, 12, 17, 23 70:9 71:21 74:8 Corrigan 33:18 counsel 1:23 72:13

County 8:5 15:2, 4 16:8, *11*, *12*, *13*, *22*, *23*, *25* 17:5 27:4, 6 28:21 29:23 30:18 35:4 couple 4:24 10:8 19:18 33:23 50:9, 11 51:7 course 5:4 12:12 17:25 46:3 COURT 1:1 4:11 8:5, *23* 11:8 12:21 13:5, 17 14:2 15:4, 20 16:3 17:10 18:6, 25 28:18 29:23 31:5, 10, 14, 22 32:1 41:11 42:4 50:13 57:5, 6 61:15 66:1, 4, 17 68:9 69:14, 19, 25 70:3, 7, 19, 22 71:6 Court's 9:2, 3 13:23 42:2 65:11 credibility 68:11 69:1, 11 credible 9:4 **crime** 67:6 criminal 6:19 8:4 9:11 10:6, 13 14:6, 25 15:5, 14, 25 16:10, 19 20:14 21:4, 18 29:24 30:6, 10, 14 35:24 36:5, 14 39:19 41:15 46:11 53:5, 8, 9 58:3, 8 64:16, 20, 25 66:8, 18 68:25 71:2, 12 72:3 criminally 53:16 CSU 66:9 **current** 38:8, 11 currently 5:24 41:11 42:3 69:9, 13 Cuyahoga 8:5 16:8 27:4 28:21 29:23 35:4 Cyoung2@clevelandohio.go v 2:19 < D > date 13:2 14:13, 20 15:11 17:16 19:5, 17 29:7 30:5, 16, 25 31:21 34:23 36:24 37:2 42:9, 19 **dated** 29:9 day 11:10 18:17 29:22 30:3 47:10 54:7, 8 74:11 days 19:18 31:21 dealer 57:2 decision 13:10 14:10 30:4 65:24 66:5 deemed 59:2 61:11 **Defendants** 1:14 2:10

Defendant's 13:17

definitely 39:6 46:1

defense's 11:17

47:18

false 70:21, 25 72:7

demonstrating 70:3 **Denise** 1:18 74:5, 18 **Department** 2:14 5:21 21:9 46:10 58:12 **Departmental** 3:13 43:11 55:12 **Deposition** 1:17 4:8, 19 7:17 73:1 describe 48:22 51:16, 25 described 34:6, 7, 8 48:4 52:23 62:1 **DESCRIPTION** 3:8 36:21 **DET** 1:11 detail 47:8 detailed 27:12 details 44:17 **Detective** 4:9 6:5 17:2 28:5 56:1, 5, 7 59:8 60:15 61:8 **detectives** 6:21 9:12 11:10 14:7 22:7 55:25 56:14 59:23 60:6 determination 60:20 determine 28:13, 18 **determined** 13:5 24:11 35:7 48:7 developments 14:6 device 50:8 different 51:8 70:4, 19, 23 direct 44:25 45:4 49:3 directly 12:6 17:24 21:8 49:9 64:23 71:2 discipline 67:19, 24 68:3 discretely 24:6 discuss 9:24 **discussion** 61:5 71:22 dismiss 18:5, 12, 17 71:25 72:5 dismissed 29:23 32:2 41:16, 18 69:17, 20 71:3 72:4 distance 51:2, 5, 14 distinctly 62:7 **DISTRICT** 1:1, 2 4:11 6:8, 9 16:8, 9, 21 21:18 31:14, 22 32:1 53:25 56:1 66:1, 17 71:24 72:5 **DIVISION** 1:3 docket 12:21 13:16 15:4 18:11 30:10 41:17, 24 dockets 18:1 30:7 document 62:17, 23 **Dodge** 48:22 52:9 doing 26:5 34:15 41:1 49:10 60:6 62:7 **Donald** 65:1, 9 dozen 15:25 **draft** 19:11, 14

drafted 27:6 drafting 27:8 drive 48:15 drive-by 64:7 driveway 23:18 51:23 driving 7:3 23:15 drop 6:12 9:22 dropped 10:22 drove 26:7, 14, 18 63:10 drug 21:5 34:5 36:7, 10 40:5 45:20, 21 50:17 53:12 57:2 drugs 20:20 35:15 50:21 61:10 due 32:4 72:7 duly 4:4 **Duty** 3:12, 14, 15 6:4 29:9 47:5 56:23 62:24, 25 63:3, 22 66:7 < E > earlier 8:4 12:5 19:5 39:12 44:1 48:9 50:6 early 36:18, 25 East 21:6 35:3, 14 40:8 42:15 47:2 49:1 61:25 63:25 74:19 EASTERN 1:3 **effort** 71:5 **eight** 6:11 either 17:22 18:20, 21, 24 37:8 49:25 53:9 54:16 55:13 67:19 71:5 elected 6:16 elements 59:3 eligible 6:12 **ELLIS** 1:5 4:9 6:20, 22 7:3 8:5 10:6 12:22 13:6 17:11 18:6 20:4, 23 24:12 29:24 30:11 35:8 40:2, 8 41:8 48:8 52:2 57:20 58:4 63:10 65:4 69:16 71:3, 25 Ellis's 24:24 26:2, 18 27:5 57:11, 23 58:7 60:25 61:7 63:7, 20, 24 e-mail 12:3 emphasis 61:1 emphasized 60:24 employed 5:24 encountered 39:21 **ended** 8:18 **enforcement** 34:21 48:12 57:15, 20, 22 **enjoying** 5:24 6:1 enter 48:25 enters 51:20 entirely 72:17 entirety 27:13 74:7

entries 18:20, 21

Entry 3:16 13:17 18:11 41:20 63:15 equipment 49:24 especially 62:10 **ESO** 2:3, 11, 12 establish 50:14, 23 established 26:24 35:6, 18 estimate 47:18 Et 1:12 4:10 **Euclid** 16:22 evaluate 59:1 event 31:15 eventually 10:20 14:22 54:1 evidence 8:13, 24 11:18 13:6, 24 14:3 17:11, 13 31:6, 9 49:9 50:13, 22, 25 52:17 53:8 58:3 64:21 65:10, 15, 21 67:5, 13, 20, 25 68:25 69:11 72:1 evidentiary 50:18 exact 47:11 exactly 18:20 examination 1:18 3:3 4:5 **examine** 58:23 example 67:2 exchange 23:23 53:16 executed 7:7, 25 62:11 executing 8:2 **execution** 44:16 58:2 **EXHIBIT** 3:6, 8 7:13, 18, 23 12:16, 20 13:16 18:11 19:3 20:2 25:12 26:24 29:4, 9 43:2, 6, 9 46:25 62:13, 17, 19, 22, 25 63:3, 6, 15, 21 66:12, 16 Exhibits 62:24 **existed** 28:19 exit 48:25 exits 51:17 expectation 58:1 expedition 67:5 **expires** 74:21 **explore** 20:21 Explorer 48:5, 22 52:1 expression 8:20 < F > face 39:19 fact 18:16 29:19 31:9, 17, 21 35:19 41:15 42:1, 5 51:1 68:23 69:10 71:11

fair 5:9 6:2, 22 11:14

18:2, 21, 22 20:6 22:12

24:10 25:1, 8 31:14 33:4

35:25 39:19 44:3 46:16

57:15 58:4 59:13

fairly 10:1

PH: 216.241.3918

familiar 40:20 **familiarize** 43:7 66:19 far 30:2 46:17 51:4 **federal** 16:5, 8 58:16, 19, 24 59:4 60:22 65:4 69:16, 19, 25 70:7, 22 71:2, 6, 12, 23 federally 59:3, 10 60:16 61:*1*, *13* female 51:17 52:11, 21 **Fifth** 6:8, 9 21:18 56:1 **figure** 9:18 file 22:2 31:18 38:17, 21, 23, 25 39:6, 9 46:18 55:3, 6 64:10 **filed** 4:16 13:18 18:16 fill 10:19 11:10 45:6 film 49:18 50:1 **find** 33:5 53:8 58:2 fine 35:2 47:4 66:23 first 4:3 6:24 7:22 10:13 20:23 24:20 28:8 29:10 34:2, 3 35:11 36:8 37:8 39:21 40:14, 18 48:4 67:1 fishing 67:5 fit 58:24 **five** 52:5 floor 33:17, 18 **folks** 10:2, 7 24:25 **follow** 10:25 followed 8:9 **following** 9:3 61:6 follows 4:4 force 16:18, 21 27:24 28:2 58:22 60:23 65:6 Ford 48:5, 21 52:1 foregoing 74:7 forget 48:11 form 21:24 43:12, 15, 17, 20 44:1 46:25 **formal** 9:20 formalized 72:17 formed 25:16 forms 25:11 four 51:25 61:23 Franks 71:6, 9 Friday 1:22 6:3 Friedman 1:20 full 5:17 further 54:2 62:8

<G> G> Gapente[spelling 45:5 gather 49:9 54:4 gathered 26:17 27:19 65:21 gathering 44:15

Page: 3

general 9:13 46:15 63:18 generate 20:16 generated 45:24 Gerhardstein 1:20 getting 15:18 32:4 Gilbert 1:20 Gina 19:24 give 15:23 36:21 38:14 41:3 44:17 54:20 56:24 given 15:15 16:1 35:3 61:15 giving 21:14 24:4 39:15 72:11 **Go** 8:16 9:6, 17 15:4 19:2 20:22 21:10 22:11 32:16 33:7, 16 42:12 44:11, 18 45:25 46:21 55:16 60:14, 21, 22 61:14 67:10, 15, 23 68:14 69:4 goes 10:20 22:7 going 5:4, 7, 8 7:10, 16, *17*, 20 11:*15*, *17* 15:20 16:*1* 17:25 18:5 19:*14* 24:8 25:1 36:13 43:5, 21 50:17, 19 61:12 66:15 **good** 6:2 51:5 61:17 64:1 **go-to** 33:18 **Grand** 11:3, 5, 8, 12 43:18 71:15 granted 13:18 18:13 guess 9:18 13:21 21:16 33:5 40:22 guidance 45:16, 18 gun 59:1 60:24, 25 61:9

<H> **half** 47:19 hand 7:16 43:5 62:16 66:15 74:10 handed 7:22 22:4 60:12 handful 16:4 handing 12:19 29:8 handled 59:9 happened 30:3 41:3 61:15 happening 36:9 harm 57:2 hearing 8:13, 19, 21 9:3 11:17, 22 12:13, 25 67:7 71:6, 9 74:7 **held** 12:25 help 16:22 56:23 **helped** 59:23 **helping** 28:17 **helps** 26:23 Henry 48:10 hereunto 74:10 heroin 41:9

Hev 40:19 61:12 high-powered 51:5 highway 21:6 **history** 68:11 **hitting** 39:13 hoc 44:11 home 27:5 57:11, 23 58:7 Honorable 4:12 **hot** 39:13 hour 42:20 47:16, 17, 18, 19 hours 29:10 42:14, 23 61:24 house 24:7, 10 26:7, 15, 19 34:16, 19 35:15 40:20, 25 48:2, 15 50:17, 19 51:14, 20 52:3 63:9, 10, 20 houses 51:7, 9, 10, 11

< I >

idea 51:13 identification 7:14 12:17 29:5 43:3 62:14, 20 66:13 identified 57:5 identifying 24:24 imagine 47:7 importance 44:13 important 27:18 38:20 **impose** 67:18 inaccurate 70:8 **include** 27:22 included 26:21 **INDEX** 3:1, 6 indicate 47:1 indicated 13:17 22:17 64:2 Indicating 37:11 indictment 18:13, 17 individual 39:18 45:9 individuals 52:5, 20 53:1, 2, 6, 10, 17 54:16 57:5 **inform** 21:8 **informal** 46:4, 6 informant 36:18 37:5 40:24 55:13 **informants** 53:3, 17 55:23 56:2, 12, 15, 24, 25 69:19, 21, 24 72:7 **information** 3:11, 13 10:14 11:1 20:19 21:14, 23 22:18, 21, 23 23:21, 24

24:2, 4 26:4, 6, 18, 20

27:15, 17, 18, 21 28:12

40:2, 5, 15, 18 41:3, 6

32:22 35:13 36:3, 4 37:3

38:20, 22, 25 39:1, 16, 18

43:12 44:15, 20 53:20, 24

54:2, 5, 25 56:22, 24 57:1, 2 70:2, 7, 9, 21, 25 **informed** 14:1 17:23 18:24 **initial** 10:14 11:1 initiated 7:3 8:9 10:17 inner 10:21 instance 16:11 intentional 67:3 intentionally 25:3 interacted 53:21 **interaction** 25:7 49:3 52:8, 14 Internal 70:6 interview 53:25 70:16 interviews 54:16 56:12 inventory 65:17 invest 63:14 investigate 21:10 22:8 26:1 investigating 15:21 34:9, 12 57:20 68:24 **investigation** 6:19, 24 7:5 8:4 11:5 20:3, 9, 15 21:3 22:12, 15 25:10, 15, 17 26:3 27:13, 18 29:13 34:5, 14, 23 38:24 44:1, 7 45:17 48:12 50:15 60:10 63:16 64:10 investigations 6:21 16:23 45:9, 20, 21 46:12, 18 49:24 50:7 investigative 55:2, 6 investigator 59:16, 19, 21 60:3 investigators 64:24 involved 6:21 8:3, 13 9:12 10:5 14:7 15:6, 14 16:10, 18, 20 18:1 23:2 30:7 48:18 60:3 64:16, 24 65:3 71:23 **involving** 6:20 11:5 25:25 issue 28:14 31:13 64:20 issued 30:22 57:9

< J>
JC 29:10
JEFFREY 1:11, 17 3:3
4:3, 5, 8 5:19
JOSEPH 2:3 4:13
Journal 3:16
JR 1:8 2:11 4:12 65:25
66:18
Jrussell2@clevelandohio.go
v 2:18
Jscott@ohiowagelawyers.c

its 74:7

om 2:9

PH: 216.241.3918

JUDGE 1:8 4:12 13:5 27:6 28:22 29:16, 19 31:10 32:13, 17, 21 33:2, 8, 14, 17, 20, 21 52:23 57:18 65:13, 20 judges 27:4 33:7 judicial 28:11 68:18 July 1:22 jurisdiction 17:1, 5 32:2 jurisdictional 16:18 Jury 11:3, 5, 8, 12 43:18 71:15 Justification 65:12, 16 justify 67:7

< K > keep 14:6 39:2 44:2 45:13 keeping 14:24 44:6 keeps 22:4 kept 46:1 Kincaid 45:1, 18 kind 21:24 30:14 33:7, 10 36:8 58:24 70:1 72:16 knew 15:5 31:15 44:15 46:17 know 9:20, 23 11:9, 11 13:12 14:13 15:10 16:22 19:19 21:12 25:24 26:20 30:3 31:20 32:10 33:3, 10, 21 34:18 36:8, 19 37:2, 5 38:5 39:2, 3, 11 40:1, 3, 4, 10, 13, 21 41:5, 20 42:5, 10 44:13 45:6, 18, 21, 22 46:1, 15, 22, 23 47:6 48:14 50:20 54:8 56:4, 23 57:7, 8 58:19, 25 61:8, 11 66:9, 20 knowledge 30:4 31:1 46:9, 14 55:11, 25 57:17, 19, 22, 25 67:17 68:8, 17 Kopchak 58:12, 15 60:12, 15, 22, 23 61:3, 6, 8 65:1, 3 67:19 68:2 71:20, 23

<L>
lack 32:2
Lake 16:11, 13, 22, 25
17:5
Lakeside 2:15
large 24:7
Law 2:14 34:21 48:11
57:15, 19, 22
lawful 4:3
Lays 36:20
lead 17:2 58:7 59:16, 18, 25

< P >

pace 65:14

learn 14:9 17:17 18:4, 7, 8 31:17 32:3 learned 14:22 17:10, 13 45:25 learning 45:23 leave 49:13 52:3 leaving 24:9 50:20 **left** 45:3 license 26:8, 14 34:19 **lied** 69:19 70:8 lieutenant 22:10 44:2 45:3, 5 line 29:10 63:25 lines 34:3 66:24 little 5:1, 12 20:21 21:17 lobby 21:14, 22 local 17:7 located 1:20 location 24:25 35:3 47:14 48:19 50:24 51:1 62:5 **long** 6:9 30:14 33:21 37:16, 18 47:13, 15 64:2 look 7:20 27:23 looked 17:20 looking 36:4 44:16, 22 46:24 looks 51:22 **Lorain** 16:12 lot 24:25 50:3 56:24

< M > Magnum 48:22 52:9 mail 10:21 maintain 38:21 maintained 22:2 **making** 39:3 male 35:14 36:19 52:21 males 48:25 49:4 52:8 March 6:25 8:9, 14, 25 13:7 17:12 20:6, 24 marijuana 41:10 mark 7:10, 17 marked 7:13, 23 12:16, 19 29:4, 8 43:2, 6 62:13, 16, 19 66:12, 16 material 27:17 matter 4:9, 20 68:25 Matthew 52:24 54:1, 4 70:5 McCormick 28:22 29:16, 19 32:14 33:2 57:18 mean 10:15 15:3 20:5, 12 57:4 66:18 meant 36:14 meet 9:12, 14, 24 32:16, 19 37:12 44:19, 21 71:14 meeting 9:21 12:10 27:3 32:13 46:5 54:3

meetings 46:4, 6 member 58:11, 12, 22 members 34:4 memory 5:1 mention 42:1, 3 69:5 mentioned 23:20 69:8 message 37:13, 19 38:16, messages 37:15 met 28:21, 24 29:19 60:16 mid 25:8 35:12 minute 43:7 minutes 7:19 47:19 62:2 monitoring 15:9 **morning** 62:10 **motion** 11:17 13:17 15:12 18:12, 16 67:6 motorcycle 23:16 move 5:3 18:5 26:22 **moving** 71:25 multiple 16:18 44:23

< N >name 4:13 5:17 37:8 70:5 Narcotics 16:13, 23 39:14 Nathan 37:9, 10 39:11 Nathaniel 37:9 near 21:6 47:24 necessarily 22:10 55:5 need 21:9 **needed** 15:11 44:13 neighborhood 23:21, 24 35:24 36:9, 14 never 49:6 59:9, 12 night 62:10 nine-month 30:24 Normally 21:25 32:24 33:16 **NORTHERN** 1:2 4:11 16:9 **Notary** 1:18 74:5, 18 **note** 38:23, 24 39:5 notepad 39:7 notes 39:3 54:25 55:2, 6 64:9, 13 74:9 notice 1:22 noticed 24:7 notification 14:4 notified 11:4, 16 13:22 November 74:21 number 4:14 28:5 38:5, 8, 11, 14 42:13 57:15 59:22

numbered 35:11

Numerous 15:16

numbers 26:8, 14 34:19

< () > Oaky 58:15 oath 4:4 70:18 **Objection** 8:15 9:5 25:20 32:11 36:1 42:8 46:13, 20 55:15 56:3 60:5, 13 67:9, 14, 22 68:13 69:3 observe 34:8 **observed** 34:7 64:*3* observing 47:20 51:10 obtain 27:5 **obtained** 59:18 60:1 obviously 6:18 occasions 26:19 occupants 50:21 occur 25:12 occurred 12:7 21:2 25:8 30:5 45:20 50:14 **offer** 68:2 **office** 9:10, 24 10:3, 14, 20, 21 11:16 12:2 13:22 14:5, 10 17:24 18:25 21:12, 13, 22 31:12 43:22 44:18, 21 46:7 54:1, 7, 10, 16, 17 58:9 68:2 71:24 72:5 74:11 officer 17:6 22:11 28:12, 18 45:8 46:19 60:12, 21 61:3, 5 67:19 68:2, 18, 24 71:20, 22 officers 34:9, 12 44:2, 6 46:11 57:15 officer's 67:2 70:12 offices 1:19 9:22 Oh 26:5 52:14 **OHIO** 1:2, 19, 21 2:7, 16 4:12 12:22 16:9 35:4 64:17 74:6, 11, 18, 19, 20 Okay 4:22 5:11, 15 6:12, 18 7:5, 10, 22 8:2, 8, 12, 20, 23 9:9, 16 10:12, 21, 24 11:4, 7 12:7, 9 13:4 14:5, 9, 14, 21 15:3, 17, 19 16:7, 15, 24 17:4, 17, 22 18:4, 10, 23 19:2, 11, 16 20:1, 8, 18 21:7, 16 22:6, *14*, *25* 23:2, *9*, *17*, *19*, *23* 24:2, 14, 17, 20 25:3, 7, 10 26:5, 9, 13, 17, 22 27:8, 17, 23 28:11, 21 29:22 30:2, 6 31:2, 17 32:1 33:1, 4, 13, 15, 20, 25 34:20 35:2 36:17 37:2, 16, 19 38:3, 5, 10, 15 39:11, 17 40:7 41:2, 7, 18, 25 42:5, 12, 19 43:20, 25 44:18, 22 45:7, *15* 46:3, *16*, *24* 47:8, *13*, 16, 20, 24 48:7, 11, 17, 21

49:17 50:12 51:13, 25

PH: 216.241.3918

52:17, 23 53:2, 15 54:3, 12, 15, 20 55:5, 8, 11, 21 56:13 57:8 58:1 59:4, 11 60:10, 17, 20 62:4 63:13, 18, 21 64:1, 6, 9, 12, 15, 19, 23 65:3, 10, 16, 20 66:3, 7, 23 67:12, 17 68:8 70:10, 12, 15 71:1, 19 **OLIVER** 1:8 4:12 once 22:4 27:6 71:25 ongoing 34:5 46:11 open 41:10 69:8, 13 operated 33:6 operations 34:6 **Opinion** 3:16 66:16, 21 opportunity 39:15 72:12 **OPS** 70:16 order 31:4 52:24 **ordered** 17:10 orders 46:15 ordinance 67:4 outrank 61:3 **outside** 16:10

packet 10:19 11:1 43:18, 19, 22 pad 39:2, 4 page 13:16 34:2, 3 35:2, 10 62:17, 23 66:24 **PAGE/LINE** 3:3, 8 paper 21:25 39:2, 4, 8 paragraph 35:11, 12 36:17 41:7 42:13 46:25 51:25 61:23 67:1 parens 42:16 parentheses 42:16 Parked 47:24 48:1, 6, 23 parks 51:16 part 9:2 16:17 24:21, 23 69:1 **participate** 6:16 32:13 34:13 48:12 71:8, 11 participated 34:4, 22 57:14 59:4 participating 54:15 particular 20:9, 14 21:19 34:22 64:24 **parties** 36:12 parts 34:1 patrol 66:9 patrolling 21:2 patrolman 58:25 patrolmen 65:2 Payne 23:6, 7, 9 24:24 25:7 26:1, 4, 6 35:22 P-A-Y-N-E 23:8 Pearson's 52:23

pending 4:10 5:14 9:11 30:8 people 10:9 24:8 34:25 50:19, 23 54:18 **perform** 20:9 22:12 **period** 16:5 24:9 25:25 30:14, 24 42:16, 21 44:24 45:4, 23 person 22:1, 23 56:22 personal 37:23 50:4 personally 34:7, 8 personnel 34:22 48:12 pertinent 27:15 phone 37:14, 20, 23 38:3, 5, 13 71:17 phones 50:4 **photo** 51:2 photograph 49:25 50:4, physical 36:21 **picks** 22:7 pin 36:24 place 15:9 25:18 48:9 Plaintiff 1:7 2:2 **PLAINTIFF'S** 3:8 7:13, 18, 23 12:16, 20 13:16 18:10 19:2 20:2 25:11 26:24 29:4, 9 43:2, 6, 9 46:24 62:13, 16, 19, 22, 24, 25 63:6, 15, 21 66:12, 16 planning 31:16 plate 26:8, 14 34:19 **plates** 34:16 **Plaza** 74:19 Pleas 8:6 27:4 28:22 29:23 31:5 33:7 Please 4:7 5:6, 17 7:19 42:13 **point** 11:2, 15 27:13 59:15, 16, 22 60:2 pointed 24:6, 11 Police 5:21 46:10, 15 58:12 67:2 **policies** 46:10 policy 55:12, 18, 20 positions 45:2 possession 39:14 41:9 53:12 possibility 23:20 40:17 48:15 possibly 36:5 50:16 55:4 64:11 post 49:13 potential 21:3 potentially 50:13 practice 15:8 33:6 55:21, 22 premises 42:16 **prep** 11:20 prepare 11:21 43:16

prepared 27:3 28:8 59:17 72:20 preparing 19:4 27:12 present 60:16, 18 61:1 presented 59:9, 12 presenting 19:11 60:11 pressed 53:5 pretextual 65:12 pretty 11:9 previously 33:2 68:24 prior 8:2 19:13, 21 43:21 62:5 68:19 probable 28:13, 18 **Probably** 6:11 18:9 21:22 30:21, 24 31:25 54:25 62:8 65:8 proceed 61:6 proceeding 11:5, 8 12:21 18:6 64:20 **proceedings** 57:6 70:22 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1 process 45:25 49:14 product 20:2 program 6:13 promoted 45:2 prosecuted 16:5 prosecuting 59:12 prosecution 8:5 10:6 16:19 56:19 58:24 60:21 64:16, 25 65:4 66:18 71:12, 24 **prosecutions** 14:25 15:5. 14, 25 16:10 59:5, 6 **prosecutor** 9:15 10:8 17:7, 19 32:4 42:10 58:16, 19, 20 59:2 60:11, 18, 22 71:14, 18 prosecutors 10:4, 5 11:21 19:12, 20 prosecutor's 9:10 10:2, *14*, 20 11:*16* 12:2 13:22 14:5, 10 17:24 18:25 31:12 43:21, 22 58:9 protect 56:23 **proved** 27:21 provide 32:21, 24 45:16, 18 provided 36:19 53:20, 21 70:21 **providing** 39:18 72:7 Public 1:18, 20 2:6 74:5, 18 **pulled** 23:18 **pulls** 51:23 purpose 27:8 43:15 67:4 purposes 7:14, 17 12:17 29:5 43:3 62:14, 20 66:13 pursuant 1:22

put 21:24 27:15 28:16 38:13, 17 39:5 47:11 55:5 69:13 70:9 < () > 72:10 38:2 < R > 66:20 67:12 61:20 70:1

PH: 216.241.3918

question 5:7, 14 17:13 19:14 25:14, 23 30:18 68:12, 15, 21 questionable 67:4 questioned 49:6 69:1, 12 questions 4:15, 25 5:4, 8 quick 71:17 quite 20:16 21:15 28:2 quote/unquote 36:19 Radovanic 52:24 54:4 70:5, 13 71:1 rate 49:15 reach 9:20 40:1 reached 10:25 40:8, 23 really 60:3 reason 33:12 45:3 54:12, 23 65:14 recall 5:1, 3 8:17 10:12 11:7, 13, 24 12:9 13:1, 2, 4, 9 14:1 16:9 18:19 19:11, 16, 20 20:8 21:1 22:25 23:2, 14 24:4 25:21 26:5, 9, 13, 17 29:1, 2 30:10 34:15, 19, 20 37:13 39:21 40:7 47:21 48:17 50:6 54:3, 9, 15, 17 60:8 62:4 63:13 64:15, 19, 23 65:10, 16, 20, 24 recanted 69:24 receive 21:15 23:9 received 20:19 22:17, 20, 22 35:13 37:3, 14, 19 40:5, 25 54:2 **recognize** 7:23 10:9 recollection 9:7 14:15 16:24 29:18 64:2 66:4 record 4:7 5:18 26:11 38:14 49:17 50:1, 8 55:22 56:1, 12, 14, 21 recorded 54:20, 23 55:14 56:18 70:10 recording 50:8 56:20 recovered 60:25 61:10 recovery 50:20 reference 69:10 referenced 63:14

refers 61:23 reflect 4:7 reflected 70:19 refresh 29:18 67:12 regarding 24:24 66:17 regards 10:12 22:15 63:21 regular 46:4 regularly 9:13 re-instruction 68:3 related 7:6 relationship 10:2 relative 4:15 20:3 22:16 29:24 45:8 66:8 reluctant 61:14 **relving** 28:12 remember 11:11 13:8 14:4, 20 17:16, 17, 19, 21 19:19, 25 21:11 22:20 23:12 26:16 34:25 37:18 38:1, 2, 8, 9 39:5, 25 40:10, 16 45:1 47:12, 13, 15 48:16, 20 49:22 50:2 53:24 54:11, 14, 19 62:7 63:12 64:8 65:13, 19 66:7, 10 68:7 remembered 15:10 repeat 68:15 rephrase 5:6 **Report** 3:12, 14, 15 24:14 29:9 43:17 47:5 50:3 62:25 63:3, 22 Reports 62:24 represent 12:20 represented 69:22 request 9:25 72:5 requesting 12:3 64:20 requests 68:10 **require** 46:10 required 54:13 55:12 requirement 58:24 68:9, residence 24:12, 24 26:2 35:7 49:1 60:25 61:7 63:8, 24 64:3 residents 47:21 residing 35:14 responsibilities 45:10 responsibility 60:11 responsible 20:14 result 20:24 44:16 67:20 resulting 67:24 retired 5:20 6:3, 15 retirement 5:25 6:1 returning 62:4 review 10:24 19:21 43:8, 23 46:11, 19 67:18 68:1 72:16, 19, 20, 23 reviewing 28:12 44:6

right 6:12, 18 7:8, 9 10:1 12:1 14:1 17:22 18:10, 18 22:18 26:2, 5, 22 27:9 28:3, 16, 19, 22 29:16 32:12 33:4, 20, 22, 25 36:13, 15 39:8 40:1, 13, 17 42:12 46:24 47:4 48:8, 21 49:1, 12 51:23 52:25 53:3, 5 57:6, 12 65:6 66:23 69:2, 15 70:15 71:20 72:14, 15 road 39:3 **role** 45:8 roles 58:23 **Room** 2:15 rotating 44:23 routine 33:6 ruling 13:23 14:2 31:19, 22 42:2 RUSSELL 2:11 8:15 9:5 25:20 32:11 36:1 38:15 42:8 46:13, 20 55:15 56:3 60:5, 13 61:17 67:9, 14, 22 68:13 69:3 72:15, 23

< S > safety 56:25 Saturn 51:16 52:11 save 38:16 **Savings** 74:19 saw 10:10 18:19, 20 saying 22:11 30:23 56:8 69:5 says 18:18 41:17 scene 53:21 schedule 9:21 scheduled 11:2 46:4 **SCOTT** 2:3, 4 3:4 4:6, 13 38:13 61:22 72:9, 24 script 67:6 seal 74:11 search 3:9 7:6, 24 8:2 19:3, 12, 21 20:1, 10 22:16 25:12, 16 26:25 27:5, 9, 10, 19 28:9, 14 29:14, 20 30:22 31:3 32:22 33:1 34:1 35:10 41:25 44:16 49:7 57:8, 11, 18, 23 58:2, 6 59:17, 18, 23 60:2 61:7, 9 62:11 65:12, 17 68:19 69:2, 23 70:20 searches 67:7 searching 65:17 second 7:5 46:25 63:25 66:24 see 10:9 13:19 15:11 18:10, 14 33:14 34:10

42:17 48:25 49:15 51:6, 18 62:9 64:7 67:8, 11 seeing 18:9 48:5 50:19 **seeking** 57:23 seen 17:25 47:5 66:21 **seized** 17:11 selling 20:20 35:15 sent 9:23 12:3, 5 13:14 sentence 66:25 sentencing 15:11 separate 63:16 September 13:11 **Sergeant** 45:1, 18, 22 70:6 session 11:21 12:4 set 42:15 47:1, 8, 21 61:24 74:10 seven 6:11 31:21 **Shaw** 63:25 **Sheehan** 33:17, 20 70:6 **sheet** 21:25 short 24:9 61:18 shortly 19:17 39:24 **show** 13:2 **showing** 50:*16* shows 41:24 signaled 24:6 signature 72:17 signed 26:25 29:7, 13, 16, 20 30:25 31:3 significant 26:18 simply 9:21 sir 10:18 17:15 19:4, 7 30:20 38:7, 18 41:22 43:11 44:9 45:12 59:7 68:1, 8 69:7 sit 34:20 40:14 48:17 63:13 66:20 69:15 72:20 site 30:18 situation 16:17 68:20 situations 17:4 small 39:15 **Smith** 52:24 54:9 71:6 sole 67:4 **SOLOMON** 1:8 4:12 somebody 12:1 21:8, 17, 20 34:18 35:19 48:14 sorry 13:13 sort 11:20 12:9 14:24 15:8 23:9 24:14 33:6 44:11 49:7 54:20 55:11 67:18 68:3, 9 sought 33:1 sound 7:7 Sounds 7:9 speak 71:5 72:12 **specific** 30:20 34:1 37:2 50:23 specifically 36:7 40:7 **speed** 65:14

spoken 71:1 spots 39:13 **Square** 1:21 2:6 standards 60:16 stands 29:11 start 19:6 **started** 10:15 26:3 **State** 1:19 5:17 11:8 12:21, 22 13:5 14:2 16:3 18:4, 6, 16 31:1, 4, 9, 16, 18 35:12 36:17 41:8 58:20 60:18, 21 61:14 64:16 74:6, 18 stated 56:7 70:13 statement 54:21 55:12 70:10 statements 55:22 56:1, 15, 18 **STATES** 1:1 4:11 **State's** 18:12 status 45:14 staving 24:8 stenotype 74:9 stenotypy 74:8 stipulations 1:23 **stop** 5:11 7:2 8:9, 14 13:7 17:12 20:6, 24 21:2 22:22, 23 23:3, 12, 15 24:15 25:25 35:20 39:13 41:10 52:11, 20 53:23 54:6 65:22 67:3, 7 **stopped** 35:20 47:9 49:6 53:1 63:10 street 20:20 24:6, 7 26:2 35:3, 15 40:9 42:15 47:2, 24 48:1, 6, 23 49:1 51:7, 17 61:25 74:19 strong 50:12, 21, 25 stuff 45:24 **stuffy** 5:12 **subpoena** 9:23 12:6 subsequent 6:19 8:4 20:3, 5 56:19 58:7 67:7 68:10 **subsequently** 25:15 52:3 successful 26:13 suggestions 46:1 suggests 63:7, 23 **Suite** 1:21 2:6 summary 70:12 **Summit** 16:11 superior 44:17, 20 supervising 22:11 44:2, 6 45:8, 11 46:11, 19 supervisor 44:12 45:1, 5, **supervisors** 44:23, 24 **supplied** 36:2 55:1 69:25 70:7

PH: 216.241.3918

supply 39:16 **supplying** 56:22, 25 **support** 20:10 supported 53:9 **supposed** 45:13 suppress 11:18 13:18, 23 14:2 15:12 67:6 **suppressed** 8:24 13:7 17:14 31:9, 15 65:11, 15, 21 67:13, 25 68:25 69:11 72:*1* suppression 8:13, 19 9:2 11:22 12:12, 24 13:14 17:10 30:4 31:5, 19 42:2 64:19, 21 65:24 67:20 sure 11:9 12:7 18:23 33:3 49:23 50:4 68:16 72:21, 22 surveillance 34:16 42:15 47:1, 9, 14, 22 48:18 50:1, 8 60:7 61:25 62:8 63:7, 11, 23 SW 29:13 sworn 4:4 system 14:23 15:8, 21 16:6 24:18 44:5, 8

<T> tailored 67:6 take 5:11, 13 7:19 10:22 21:20, 22 25:17 31:13 43:7, 25 55:8, 21 61:12, *18* 71:8 taken 1:17 4:9, 19 takes 21:20 talk 6:18 15:24 talked 61:11 **talking** 42:23 task 16:18, 20 58:22 60:23 tasked 20:14 tell 5:2, 6, 13 64:10 72:13 **telling** 53:15 Terminal 2:5 test 4:25 **testified** 4:4 11:7 70:18 testify 8:20 69:22 71:15 testifying 11:11 testimony 69:25 70:3 text 37:13, 14, 19 38:16, 25 thank 72:11, 24 things 4:24 17:23 30:3 think 4:21 13:3 15:23 16:13, 20 26:7 33:16, 20 35:6, 18 36:8 39:12 40:4, *11*, *19*, *23* 41:2 45:*13*, *20* 47:11, 16 49:15 50:10, 21

35:16 36:22 41:1, 12

51:4 58:22 60:23 62:1 64:6 65:1, 13 66:22 70:5 **third** 13:15 35:10 thorough 53:25 thought 27:21 28:17 44:12 49:14 60:15 61:2 three 52:2, 6 ticket 23:22, 25 36:3 time 5:11 12:25 13:22 14:2, 9, 14, 19 15:4, 5, 15, *23*, *24* 16:*1*, *4* 17:9 24:9 25:25 27:14 28:8 30:1, 5, 11, 14, 19 32:5 33:21 34:13 38:1, 6 42:11 44:24, 25 45:4 47:8 49:3 50:3 51:22 54:4, 6 57:24 59:15, 16 60:2 61:18 62:5 65:1, 7, 8 timely 31:18 times 10:8 26:7 38:2 47:11 50:3 64:1 title 58:21 today 4:8, 14, 25 7:21 31:25 34:20 40:14 48:17 63:13 66:21 69:16 72:10, 11 told 23:23 35:22, 23 61:25 70:4 total 51:13 52:2, 5 **Tower** 2:5 track 14:24 traffic 4:23 7:2 8:9, 14 17:12 20:6, 24 21:2 22:22, 23 23:3, 9, 15, 22 24:15 25:25 35:20, 23 36:3 39:13 41:10 67:3 trafficking 34:6 transcript 72:16, 21 74:9 **Trial** 65:11 tried 45:6 true 74:8 try 5:6 trying 9:18 14:10 21:16 25:24 26:7 33:5 40:22 50:14 **Tuesday** 63:11 turn 13:15 35:10 66:23 **turned** 25:5 turns 52:21 two 6:21 16:10 30:3 31:12 48:25 49:4 52:8, 20 53:1, 2, 6 65:6 type 44:1 50:1, 7, 8 **typical** 32:16 typically 9:9, 10 14:6 15:14 43:20, 25 64:12

<U> ultimate 13:10

ultimately 8:24 13:5 24:11 27:9 28:21 35:7 48:7 51:20 57:5 69:17 72:4 unaware 30:1 56:11 **understand** 4:17 15:3 21:16 25:23 30:23 31:2, 24 59:24 understanding 5:20 24:17 58:15 72:3 understood 27:23 28:11 45:7, 16, 19 **unit** 6:7, 8, 10 21:23 34:5 39:12 44:25 45:22 49:22 50:5, 10 56:5, 6, 9, 10, 14 66:10 **UNITED** 1:1 4:10 unlawful 67:3 unsure 37:8 upholding 66:4 Use 49:20 67:3 usually 33:18, 19 39:2 59:8

< V > Vaguely 64:18, 22 65:13 valuable 27:22 value 28:17 50:18 56:20 Vanessa 52:24 54:9 71:6 varied 30:9 vehicle 7:3 47:21, 23 48:8 49:4, 7 51:23 52:20 64:7 65:17 vehicles 52:2, 6 venues 16:11 versus 4:9 12:22 64:17 Vice 6:8, 9 21:23 45:22 56:9, 10, 14 Victor 23:6, 7 35:22 video 50:16, 19, 24 view 48:2 Villa[spelling 19:24 violation 23:22

volume 24:7 50:16

vs 1:9

<W>
waiting 49:15
waive 72:17
walk 21:17
want 5:11 22:11 28:16
33:25 38:13 42:12 49:13
72:10
wanted 50:23
warrant 3:10 7:6, 24 8:3
19:3, 12, 21 20:1, 10
22:17 25:12, 16 26:25
27:5, 9, 10, 19 28:9, 14
29:14, 20 30:22 31:3
32:23 33:8 34:1 35:11

41:25 44:16 57:8, 18, 23 58:2 59:17, 18, 23 60:2 61:9 62:11 68:19 69:2, 23 70:20 warrants 33:1 68:10 way 12:7 20:13 40:13 49:17 60:8 69:12 70:2 ways 21:15 22:14 **weapon** 61:*1* wearable 24:18 wearing 24:18 website 15:2 17:20 18:9 Well 13:15 14:5 20:21 26:22 27:21 30:23 31:17 36:4, 12 40:7 45:15 50:23 51:4 57:4 59:4, 24 60:17 61:3, 14 65:16 went 24:15 26:1 57:17 58:19 We're 6:18 7:16 15:21 33:8 we've 4:14 26:24 35:18 62:16 **WHEREOF** 74:10 white 24:8 48:25 51:17, 22 52:8, 11, 20 WILLIAM 1:5 4:9 6:20 12:22 24:12 35:7 52:1 Winters 2:4 witness 15:1 59:11 71:15 72:22 74:10 Woods 64:17 65:25 66:18 67:13, 20 work 9:9, 10, 13, 22 21:21 44:14 worked 9:19 10:7, 8 37:16 workers 21:22 working 10:2 42:19 worried 56:25 57:1 worthwhile 26:20 Wright 37:10, 11, 12, 15, *17* 39:*11*, *14*, *17*, *22* 40:*1* W-R-I-G-H-T 37:10, 11 write 23:24 34:4 36:3 37:9 writes 22:*1* writing 19:6 54:24 written 39:4 54:21 55:14 66:25 wrong 56:8 wrote 27:24 38:22 39:6 74:7

<**Y** > **YASENCHACK** 1:11, 17 3:3 4:3, 5, 8, 10, 13 5:19 7:16 12:19 29:8 43:5, 8 64:15 66:15 72:9

PH: 216.241.3918

Yeah 8:18 9:14 10:4
13:10 16:4, 16 18:18
19:19 20:21 22:5 25:15
33:11 41:24 44:21 48:6
53:23 63:20 65:8 69:18
72:15
years 4:21 6:11 27:25
28:3, 5 33:24 45:19 65:9
68:5
Yep 13:20 52:4, 7 57:10
yesterday 48:10
YOUNG 2:12

< Z > zone-car 58:25

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 84 of 121. PageID #: 342

Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 37-4 Filed: 04/23/21 3 of 7. PageID #: 343

STATE OF OHIO)	COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
)	CRIMINAL DIVISION
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)	AFFIDAVIT FOR SEARCH WARRANT

Before me a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, personally appeared the undersigned, Detective Jeffrey Yasenchack, Badge #2362, who being first duly sworn deposes and says that he is a member of the Cleveland Police Department. Affiant states that he has been a member of the Cleveland Police Department for nearly twenty-two years, had been a member of the Cleveland Police Department Narcotics Unit for two years, and has been a detective in the 5th District Vice unit for the past six years. Affiant states that he has received training in the identification and testing of illegal narcotics, recognition of controlled substances, the methods of packaging controlled substances on the street and the manner in which sellers of controlled substances operate and the detection of narcotics trafficking as his basic course at the Cleveland Police Academy. Affiant states that he has made thousands of arrests for violations of state drug laws. Affiant has interviewed hundreds of drug traffickers as well as drug abusers. Affiant has participated in the execution of hundreds of search warrants. Affiant has participated in hundreds of purchases of narcotics using confidential informants. Based on the above training and experience, affiant is familiar with the modus operandi of persons involved in the illegal distribution of controlled substance as well as the terminology used by persons involved in the illegal distribution of controlled substances. Affiant has participated with other members of his unit in an ongoing investigation into the drug trafficking operations described below; affiant has not always personally observed everything described below, but that which he did not personally observe was described to him by the other investigating officers who did.



Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 37-4 Filed: 04/23/21 5 of 7. PageID #: 345

2913, 2923, and 2925 or other fruits and instrumentalities of crimes at the present time unknown.

The facts upon which Affiant bases such belief are as follows:

- 1. Affiant avers that in mid April 2020 he received information from a concerned citizen about a black male residing at 638 East 127 St. selling drugs out of his house. The citizen further stated that a lot of white people were arriving at this house, staying a short time and then leaving and the male has been driving a black SUV.
- 2. Affiant avers that in early May 2020 a confidential informant (CI) provided affiant with information on a black male known as "Lays," described as tall, over six feet, 240 lbs., bald or shaved head, approximately 35-40 years old, drives a black Ford Explorer with Ohio plate HYH8894, and lives at 638 East 127 St. Affiant using google maps brought up this area and CI pointed out the house. CI stated he sells heroin and crack cocaine and instructed affiant to watch the house and observe the volume of white people arriving to buy drugs.
- Affiant avers that he ran the plate HYH8894 through the OHLEG database and learned the owner was a known male, William Ellis, dob 9-18-1978, SS#***-**-6706. The CI when shown a BMV photo of Ellis positively identified him as the male CI knew as "Lays." Affiant arrested Ellis in 2019 having in his possession heroin, carfentanil, cocaine, and marijuana during a traffic stop. This case is open and currently in appeals court.
- 4. Affiant avers that during the past seventy-two hours affiant set up surveillance on 638 East 127 St. (the Premises). The black Ford Explorer was parked on the street in front of the premises. After a few minutes a burgundy Dodge Magnum parked on the street. Two white males exited and knocked on the front door. Ellis opened the door and held the security door open while the two white males entered the premises. A blue Saturn parked on the street, a white female exited, and walked to the premises' front door. She was also let in by Ellis who stepped onto the porch, looked down the street just as a white vehicle pulled into the driveway of the premises. Two people from that vehicle entered the premises. The first two males exited and drove off. The female exited, re-entered the Saturn, and drove off. The listed owner of the Saturn who matched the female affiant observed had convictions for drug possession. A couple minutes later the last two people exited the premises and drove off. Affiant stopped this last vehicle and recovered fentanyl from the occupants.
- 5. Affiant avers that the occupants became confidential informants (CIs) and supplied information about their dealer known as "Blaze." He was described as a black male, 6'4", 250 lbs., bald with a beard, about 40 years old. CIs positively identified their dealer when shown a BMV photo of Ellis. They had purchased heroin from Blaze over a dozen times, contacting him via phone#216-407-1016.

Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 37-4 Filed: 04/23/21 6 of 7, PageID #: 346

- 6. Affiant avers that he field tested, using a NIK field test kit, a sample of the suspected heroin, which did test positive for the presence of fentanyl. Affiant avers that the NIK field test kit has been utilized by affiant and members of the Cleveland Police Department in the past on numerous occasions, and when said field tested substances were re-tested by the Cuyahoga county lab, the results of the NIK test have always proven to be true and accurate; said field test has never proven to be inaccurate in the experience of affiant. Affiant avers that the fentanyl was sealed into drug bag#589960 and has been submitted to the county lab for testing, results still pending.
- Affiant avers that a check of the Cuyahoga county felony docket revealed the following convictions for Ellis: 1996 case# CR-96-346236 pleading guilty to attempted drug possession M1 receiving nine months of community control, 1997 case# CR-97-349373 drug trafficking F4, drug possession F5 receiving one year of community control, 2000 case# CR-00-397031 receiving stolen property (MV) receiving one year of community control, 2001 case# CR-01-415901 fleeing and eluding M1 receiving a six month jail term, 2006 case# CR-07-495646 kidnapping with sexual motivation spec F1, gross sexual imposition F4, assault M1, receiving a five year prison term, 2007 case# CR-07-498821 felonious assault F3, criminal damaging M1 receiving a three year prison term, and open 2020 case# CR-20-648922 failure to comply with a police order.
- 8. Affiant avers that a check of the OHLEG database revealed an eSORN entry for Ellis due to his gross sexual imposition conviction in 2007 and has to register his address with the Cuyahoga County Sheriff's office. The last supplied address was 638 East 127 St. and listed his vehicle as a black Ford Explorer with temp tag H237873, which is the same Explorer with Ohio plate HYH8894.
- 9. Based on these facts, affiant avers that he has probable cause to believe, and does believe that the above described items will be found within the Premises, attached garage, curtilage, and all persons, vehicles, and safes located therein.
- 10. In the experience of affiant, persons who traffic in illegal drugs frequently keep records of illegal transactions, including computers and computer files and discs, and evidence of communications used in the furtherance of drug trafficking activity, including, but not limited to, pagers, cellular telephones, answering machines, and answering machine tapes.
- In the experience of affiant, persons who traffic in illegal drugs frequently keep weapons, such as firearms, on or about their person, or within their possession, for use against law enforcement officials, as well as other citizens.
- 12. In the experience of affiant, narcotic drugs are frequently carried or concealed by people who are present at locations where drugs are used, possessed, kept, or being sold and the size of usable quantities of drugs are small, making them easy to conceal on one's person. It is also affiant's experience that drug houses will be occupied by numerous individuals. Some persons will be involved with the direct sales, some

Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 37-4 Filed: 04/23/21 7 of 7. PageID #: 347

with the job of protecting the premises, some with preparing and packaging drugs, and some with the collection of the monies generated from the illegal activity. It is also affiant's experience and training that those who are traffic in illegal drugs will usually not permit those who are unaware or uninvolved in drug trafficking activity or use within the premise where the trafficking is conducted. It is therefore necessary to search all persons located in the premises.

- 13. Affiant avers that in his experience, persons who traffic in illegal drugs frequently keep illegal narcotics, records of illegal transaction, money, firearms, weapons and other contraband in safes.
- 14. Affiant avers that it may urgently be necessary that the Premises be searched in the night season forthwith to prevent the above-described property from being concealed or removed, and for the safety of the executing officers.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

Jeffrey Yasenchack, Detective Cleveland Police Department

5th District Vice Unit

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 17

WURT OF COMMON PLEAS

Cuyahoga County, Ohio

CASE INFORMATION

CR-19-637876-A THE STATE OF OHIO vs. WILLIAM ELLIS

View Printer Friendly Version

Docket Information

From Filing Date	The second secon				r Results t Search
Proceeding	Filing	Docket	Docket	Docket	View
Date	Date	Party	Type	Description	Image
05/14/2020	05/14/2020	N/A	JE	STATE'S MOTION DISMISS INDICTMENT FILE ON 05/13/2020 IS GRANTED. CASE DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. 05/14/2020 CPRMI 05/14/2020 09:43:2	D IS
05/13/2020	05/13/2020	P1	NT	STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY UNDI RULE 16, FILED.	ER .
05/13/2020	05/13/2020	P1	MO	MOTION FILED BY P1 THE STATE OF OHIO STATE'S MOTION TO DISMISS INDICTMENT 05/26/2020 -	
				UNKNOWN	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

Sua sponte, this 04/22/2020 04/22/2020 N/A JE appeal is dismissed for lack of lack of jurisdiction. Having considered the parties' briefs filed in response to this court's show cause order of March 30. 2020, we conclude that appellant's untimely appeal outside the relevant period specified in Crim.R. 12(K) and App.R. 4(B)(4) deprived the court of jurisdiction over this appeal. See State v. Bassham, 94 Ohio St.3d 269, 2002-Ohio-797, 762 N.E.2d 963. Appeal is dismissed. Notice issued. 09/30/2019 09/30/2019 D1 CL RECORD ON APPEAL, PAGINATION SHEET AND CRIMINAL FILE SENT TO THE **COURT OF** APPEALS. APPEAL, PRCPE, & 09/05/2019 09/05/2019 D1 SR **DCKTNG** STMNT(39687158) SENT BY REGULAR MAIL SERVICE. TO: CHRISTINE A. **RUSSO 11005** PEARL ROAD SUITE 4 STRONGSVILLE, OH 44136-0000

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1	. Filed:	08/31/23	90 of 121.	PageID	#: 348
GRANTED. MATTER SET FOR					:
SI 610Z/91/90					:
SUPRESS FILED ON					
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO					:
.6102/81/20NO					
THE DEFENDANT					
ON MOTION TO SUPRESS FILED BY					N T T
SET FOR RULING					
THIS MATTER IS					:
REPORTER KERRI NESTOR PRESENT.					
PRESENT. COURT					
CAROLINE NELSÓN					<u> </u>
RUSSO PRESENT. PROSECUTOR(S)					:
CHRISTINE A.					: :
 COURT. COUNSEL					:
DEFENDANT IN	ΊE	Α/N	8/23/2019	30 6	08/23/201
08\S3\S016					\$ to
DEFENDANT.					
REQUEST OF					
09/05/2019 AT 10:00 HT TA .MA					· ; ;
PRETRIAL SET FOR	ЭΓ	A/N	8/23/2019	30 6	08/23/201
FEE					£.
COURT REPORTER	SO	Α\N	9/26/2019	30 6	102/92/80
FILED HOLDS OF ALL ENGE			01.07/00/	20 0	107/00/00
NOTICE OF APPEAL	ΤN	ÞΙ	9/02/50/9	DU 6	102/90/60
108970 108970					t.
APPEALS CASE					
COURT OF					
CONNSEL AND THE					:
EILED BY					; ; ;;
NOTICE OF APPEAL	TN	DI	9/02/50/9	60 6	102/90/60

Ca	ase: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24	-1 Filed:	08/31/23	91 of 121.	PageID	#: 349
	THE DEFENDANT'S					
	NO TAS SI AATTAM					:
	SIHT .∃TATS					
	BHALF OF THE					
	PRESENT ON					-
	YESENCHACK,					
	JEFFREY DETECTIVE					
	CLEVELAND POLICE					;
	PRESENT. CITY OF					:
	CARL MAZZONE,					:
	PROSECUTOR					
	PRESENT					
	KLODNICK					
	LORRAINE J					
	REPORTER					
	PRESENT. COURT					:
	CAROLINE NELSON					:
	PROSECUTOR(S)					
	RUSSO PRESENT.					8
	COURT. COUNSEL CHRISTINE A.					
	DEFENDANT IN	ΊE	₩/N	8/08/2016	2 ∩ 6	08/06/201
		<u> </u>	V/IN	0700/30/0	,0 0	100/30/00
	COURT REPORTER FEE	ce	A/N	8/02/2018	30 6	102/70/80
	.03.8\$					
	IN THE AMOUNT OF					
	NUMBER 1294739,					
	SUBPOENA					· :
	EEES FOR					
	SHEBILL SEBAICE	SB	Α/N	6102/60/8	30 6	102/60/80
	.03.8\$					
	JO TUUOMA 3HT VI					
	NUMBER 1294740,					
	SUBPOENA					
	FEES FOR	70	3.778.L	01.07/00/0	00 0	107/00/00
	SHERIFF SERVICE	SB	A ∖I/I	8/09/2019	30 6	102/60/80
	14:30:29					
	CPRMD 08/23/2019					:
	AM. 08/23/2019					
	00:01 TA 610S\20\60					

Se. 1.22-00-00815-50 D00#. 24
FEES FOR
SHERIFF SERVICE
STATE SUBPOENA (1294739)
ISSUED (1294740)
STATE SUBPOENA
PRINTED FOR SUBPOENA 1294739
MITNESS YOUCHER
CALLING WITNESS
15:38:16
CPRMD 08/06/2019
6102/90/80 MG
0E:10 TA 910S\ES\80
CONTINUED TO
HEARING
BX 08/19/2019.
EXHIBITS C AND D.
NEBSION OF
FORMATTED
ATAUOD
ANT OT TIMBUS OT
DELENSE CONNSET
AND SUBMITTED.
DAA3H A3TTAM
COURT RULED THIS
ARGUEMENTS, THE
HEARD CLOSING
AND D. THE COURT
EXHIBITS A, B, C,
DEFENSE ENTERED
TESTIMONY THE STATS.
COURT HEARD
STATEMENTS, THE
OPENING
COURT HEARD
O6/16/2019, THE
SUPRESS FILED ON
MOTION TO
OT MOITOM

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 92 of 121. PageID #: 350 **BS** A\N 610S\81\70 01/18/2019 07/24/2019 88 88 07/24/2019 SB A\N 610S\30\80 08/06/2019 C2 A/N 610S/80/80 6102/90/80

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #:	24-1 Filed:	08/31/23 93 of 121. Pag	eID #: 351
SHERIFF SERVICE FEES FOR NUMBER 1288469, IN THE AMOUNT OF 18.50.	8S	A\N	01/02/20/19
STATE SUBPOENA (88S18S1) GBUSS1	8S	A\N	07/02/2019
STATE SUBPOENA ISSUED (1291269)	as	A\N	01/02/20/19
SUBPOENA 1291269 CALLING WITNESS PRINTED FOR SUBPOENA 1291268	2B C2	A\N	6102/91/70
WITNESS VOUCHER PRINTED FOR	88	A/N 6102/31/70	6102/91/70
CONVERTED TO AN ATTORNEY CONFERENCE. MOTION TO SUPPRESS HEARING SET FOR 08/06/2019 AT 09:00 AM. 07/16/2019 CPRMD 07/19/2019 10:33:07 CALLING WITNESS	CS	∀/N 610Z/91/Z0	6102/91/20
FEES FOR SUBPOENA HUMBER 1291268, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8.50.	JE	A\N 610S\61\70	6102/91/20
SUBPOENA SUBPOENA SB.50. SB.50.	88	A\N 610S\81\T0	6102/81/70

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 93 of 121. PageID #: 351

STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY UNDER RULE 16, FILED.	ΤN	19 6102/61/90	6102/61/90
THE STATE'S MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF 06/19/2019 IS 06/19/2019 IS PREVIOUSLY SET PREVIOUSLY SET PREVIOUSLY SET TOR 06/19/2019 AT 12:30PM IS RESET 12:30PM IS RESET 12:30PM IS RESET TOR 06/19/2019 AT 12:30PM IS RESET 12:30PM IS RESET TOR 06/19/2019 AT 12:30PM IS RESET 13:30PM IS RESET 14:30PM IS RESET 15:30PM IS RESET	ĴΕ	A\N 610S\3S\90	6102/61/90
SHERIFF SERVICE SUBPOENA NUMBER 1286563, IN THE AMOUNT OF	8 S	A\N	6102/02/90
SHERIFF SERVICE SUBPOENA NUMBER 1286564, IN THE AMOUNT OF 18.50.	88	A\N	06/20/2019
SHERIFF SERVICE SUBPOENA NUMBER 1286566, IN THE AMOUNT OF 18.50.	8S	A\N 610S\0S\80	06/20/2019

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 94 of 121. PageID #: 352

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #:	24-1 Filed:	08/31/23 95 of 121. Pag	geID #: 353
S'ATATS SATNEMENTAL	ΙN	19 6102\70\80	6102/70/90
SUBPOENA 1287438			
WITNESS VOUCHER PRINTED FOR	SB	A/N 6102/11/90	102/11/90
CALLING WITNESS	cz	A\N 6102\11\80	6102/11/90
FEES FOR SUBPOENA NUMBER 1287438, IN THE AMOUNT OF 18.50.			
SHEKIŁŁ SEKNICE (1587438)	SB	A\N 610S\11\80	6102/11/90
STATE SUBPOENA	SB	A\N 6102\11\80	6102/11/90
PRETRIAL HELD 06/11/2019. MOTION TO SUPPRESS 06/19/2019 AT 12:30 PM. AT THE REQUEST OF REQUEST OF 06/11/2019 CPRMD 06/11/2019 CPRMD	ĴΕ	A\N 6102\21\80	6102/11/90
(1288309) DEFENSE DEFENSE	88	A\N 6102\41\80	6102/41/90
STATE SUBPOENA ISSUED (1288469)	88	A\N	6102/11/90
SHERIFF SERVICE FEES FOR SUBPOENA NUMBER 1288309, IN THE AMOUNT OF 15.50.	8S	A\N 6102\81\80	6102/81/90
NUKNOMN CONTINUANCE, MOTION FOR	OW	19 6102/61/90	6102/61/90

C	ase. 1.22-cv-00013-30 Duc #. 24	+-1 i iieu.	00/31/23 30 01 121. 1 ag	CID #. 334
	PRETRIAL HELD 05/21/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET FOR 05/21/2019 AT 09:00AM IS RESET TA 66/04/2019 AT FOR 06/04/2019 AT THE	Ξſ	A\N 610S\SS\30	6102/12/90
	PRETRIAL HELD 06/04/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET FOR 06/04/2019 AT FOR 06/11/2019 AT FOR 06/11/2019 AT POSOORM. AT THE 09:00AM. AT THE REQUEST OF REGUEST	ЭE	A/N 6102/70/80	6102/40/90
	ISSNED (1586563)			01.07/00/00
	ISSUED (1286564) STATE SUBPOENA	8S	A/N 610S/20/90	06/02/2019
	STATE SUBPOENA	SB	A\N 9105\20\90	06/05/2019
	STATE SUBPOENA (386566)	88	A\N 610S\Z0\80	6102/20/90
	RESPONSE TO RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR MOTION FILED. MOTION FILED BY PATHE STATE OF PATHE STATE OF RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO SUPPRESS OS/26/2020 - ON/26/2020 - ON/26	OW	19 6102/70/90	6102/20/90

PRETRIAL HELD 04/25/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET 09:00AM IS RESET FOR 05/08/2019 AT PEFENDANT. PEFENDANT. PEFENDANT. 04/25/2019 14:44:21	Ξſ	∀/N 610Z/6Z/ \ 0	04/25/2019
MOTION FILED BY DAKNOWN FILED BY WOTION FOR TIME 05/2020 - TIME 05	OW	10 6102/10/90	6102/10/90
PRETRIAL HELD 05/08/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET 09:00AM IS RESET COR 05/08/2019 AT FOR 05/08/2019 AT REQUEST OF REQUEST OF REQUEST OF REGUEST	Ξſ	A/N 6102/21/30	02/08/5019
DEFENDANT. 05/22/2019 09:06:14 05/22/2019 09:06:14 05/22/2019 09:06:14 05/2020	OW	IG 6102/91/90	6102/91/90

STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS HILED . MOTION FILED BY FILED . D1 WILLIAM W ELLIS D1 WILLIAM W ELLIS EVIDENCE NOTICE	OM	03/20/2019 D1	03/28/2019
FILED.		,	0,00,00,0
STATE'S DEMAND FOR DISCOVERY,	ΤN	14 6103/50/40	04/03/2019
PRETRIAL HELD 04/04/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET 09:00AM IS RESET COB 04/04/2019 AT FOR 04/09/2019 AT REQUEST OF REQUEST	ĴΕ	A/N 6102/30/40	6102/40/40
04/09/2019. PRETRIAL PREVIOUSLY SET FOR 04/09/2019 AT FOR 04/25/2019 AT FOR 04/25/2019 AT PEFENDANT. PEFENDANT. O4/09/2019 CPRMD 04/10/2019 CPRMD			
PRETRIAL HELD	ΊE	A\N 6102\01\40	04/06/2019

	Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24	-1 Filed:	08/31/23	99 of 121.	PageID #: 357	, a
	DEFENDANT COUNSEL. COUNSEL. RETAINED RUSSO, CHRISTINE A. AS COUNSEL. READING OF INDICTMENT INDICTMENT FOUR HOUR	3 F	∀/N	8\78\504	0 6102/8	03/28
12	COURT					:
	PRISONER IN	CS	A\N	3\28\2019	8\2019 03	03/28
	\$2,500.00 PERSONAL BOND 03/28/2019 BY DEFENDANT. BOND NO. 726665	BN	∀/N	610Z/8Z/8	8\5046 03/8	03\58
	MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS, FILED. MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS 05/26/2020 - UNKNOWN	OW	lа	8\28\2019	3/S016 03	03/28
	NOTION FOR DISCOVERY, FILED MOTION FOR MOTION FOR MOTION FOR THE PARTIEN FOR FOR THE PARTIEN F	OW	١a	6102/82/8	8).2019 03	03\58
	UNKNOWN MOTION FILED BY MOTION FOR PRODUCTION PRODUCTION PRODUCTION UNKNOWN	OW	١a	8\28\2019	8\2019 O3	03/58
	02/26/2020 -					1

CRIMINAL (38062675) SENT BY FEDERAL 500 KARL DR. CLEVELANM 500 KARL DR. 441430000			
- SNOWWNS	ЯS	A\N 6102\£1\£0	03/13/2019
WRIT FEE	CS	A\N 6102\£1\£0	03/13/2019
ARRAIGNMENT SCHEDULED FOR 03/27/2019.	dЭ	A\N 6102\41\80	6102/21/20
COC 03/S0/S019. HEDEX 03/19/S019 DELIVERED BY DELIVERED BY	ЯЅ	A/N 6102\02\20	610Z/0Z/£0
CASE CONTINUED TO 03/28/2019 AT REQUEST OF TNAUNAT.	1E	A/N 6102/72/50	6102/72/20
SERVICE WAIVED. DEFENDANT PLEAD NOT GUILTY TO INDICTMENT. BOND SET AT 2,500.00 DOLLARS. BOND TYPE: PERSONAL DEBORAH M (375) DEBORAH M (375) ASSIGNED ASSIGNED ASSIGNED ASSIGNED ASSIGNED AN IN COURT ROOM JC20D JUDGE DEBORAH M. TURNER.			

03/04/2019	СК	A/N 610S/90/E0	03/04/2019
03/04/2019 DATE OF OFFENSE	СК	A/N 610S/90/50	03/04/2019
CASE INFORMATION ENTERED	СВ	A/N 610S/90/60	03/00/2016
CFEBK LEE	SE	A\N 6102\41\60	03/13/2019
COMPUTER FEE	SF	A\N 6102\41\60	03/13/2019
CRIME STOPPERS	SE	03/14/2019 N/A	03/13/2019
COURT SPECIAL PROJECTS FUND	SF	A/N 6102/41/60	03/13/2019
LEGAL RESEARCH	SE	A\N 6102\41\20	03/13/2019
INDICTED ORIGINAL ON 03/13/2019	СК	A\N 6102\£1\£0	03/13/2019

Only the official court records available from the Cuyahoga County Clerk of Courts, available in person, should be relied upon as accurate and current.

Copyright © 2023 PROWARE. All Rights Reserved. 1.1.268

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 101 of 121. PageID #: 359

CLEVELAND DIVISION OF POLICE ZONE 5 PLATOON VICE RADIO CALL NO. 5V85											
		YTUC	REPO	ORT	TOL	DAY Thurs.	5-14-2020 TIME 0900 HRS.	MILEAGE			
					TOU	R FINISH Thurs.	5-14-2020 1700 HRS.				
VEHICLE CO		CAR#	GAS C	ARD#	SHOTGUN# A	MMO. BOX# PORTABLE T	TOTAL	ECK BY:			
005L0629 UC 13841						1850482					
CIRCLE DAMAGED	2	3	4 9	ТОР	DESCRIBE DAMAGE:		OLD NEW DAMAGE R	IEW			
AREAS	1 (UNDER CA	R 360	MINOR WCS J					
Due for Se	8 ervice Mi	7 leage:	6		Due for Service D	ate:	Due for Service Sticker:	Y/N			
CAMPAGE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PART				DCAST	T-TELEPHONE D-DISTR	ICT O-ON VIEW OR OTH					
SOURCE	SOURCE REC'D. ARR. COMP. CODE			LOCATION AND NAT	URE OF ASSIGNMENT	DISPOSITION	CAD NUMBER				
0	-	0900	,	Desire - re	JC	CASE INVEST	SW SIGNED BY JUDGE MCCORMICK	-			
0		0940			5D	RC /VEH. CHECK					
0		7	,		5D	CASE INVEST	PREPPED FOR SW				
0		1050	1330		E127/SHAW AREA	CASE INVEST	SURVEILLANCE / INFO REC'D TARGET NOT				
0		-/	1330		IDAROSE AREA	CASE INVEST	CHECKED ADDRESS				
0		7	,		E146 STCLAIR	CASE INVEST	CHECKED ADDRESS				
0		./	,								
-		1,	,		E148/LYTTON AREA	CASE INVEST	CHECKED ADDRESSES				
0		P			E152/WESTROPP	LUNCH	COMP				
0		1440	/		5D ;	CASE INVEST	EMAILS/ CONF W/KANE/GG/SWA	.T			
0		1645	1700		5D	RELIEF	COMP				
						-					
							 				
						0.	 				
					(4 6)		-				
					1		 	_			
					<u>_</u>	-					
						300					
					1						
MISC. STATS	S/EQUIPME	NT			ж ж						
ARRESTS			CITATION	S ISSUED	ISSUED	And the second section of the section of the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the sectio					
FEL.	MISD.		TRF.	M. M	ISD. PKG. INFRA	CTIONSMISD. SUMI	MONS RADIO ASSIGNMENTS				
			#	0	John f-	# 230		H			
PASSENGER		AINT	IFF'S		DRIVER .		EXAMINED & APPROVED BY	nti			
	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT # 8499										

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 103 of 121. PageID #: 361

Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 43-9 Filed: 05/07/21 1 of 3. PageID #: 405

C OF C 71-1.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

CLEVELAND, OHIO
DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION

DIST. 5 ZONE	<u>May 20,</u> 2020
EXAMINED BYRANK	2020
FROM Det. Jeffrey A. Yasenchack #2362	TO Lt. Charles DePenti 8499
SUBJECT Drug Trafficking Investigation into William	Ellis 2020-139102
cories to Unit files, Personnel files	

In mid April 2020 I received information from a concerned citizen about a black male residing at 638 East 127 St. selling drugs out of his house. A lot of white people arriving at the house, staying a short time and then leaving. This male has been driving a black SUV. In early May 2020 a confidential informant (CI-1) provided me with information about a black male known as "Lays." described as tall, over six feet, 240 lbs., bald or shaved head, approximately 35-40 years old, drives a black Ford Explorer with Ohio plate HYH8894, and lives at 638 East 127 St. Using Google maps I brought up this area and CI pointed out the house. CI stated he sells heroin and crack cocaine and instructed me to watch the house and observe the volume of white people arriving to buy drugs. I ran the plate HYH8894 through the OHLEG database and learned the owner was a known male. William Ellis, dob 9-18-1978, SS#***-**-6706. The CI when shown a BMV photo of Ellis positively identified him as the male CI knew as "Lays." I arrested Ellis in 2019 having in his possession heroin, carfentanil, cocaine, and marijuana during a traffic stop. This case is open and currently in appeals court.

On May 11, 2020 I set up surveillance on 638 East 127 St. The black Ford Explorer was parked on the street in front of the house. After a few minutes a burgundy Dodge Magnum parked on the street. Two white males exited and knocked on the front door. Ellis opened the door and held the security door open while the two white males entered the house. A blue Saturn parked on the street, a white female exited, and walked to the front door. She was let in just as a white vehicle pulled into the house's driveway. Two people from that vehicle entered the house. The first two males exited and drove off in the Magnum. The female exited, re-entered the Saturn, and drove off. The listed owner of the Saturn who matched the female I observed had convictions for drug possession. A couple minutes later the last two people exited the house and drove off. I stopped this last vehicle and recovered suspected fentanyl from the occupants.

The occupants became confidential informants (CIs) and supplied information about their dealer known as "Blaze." He was described as a black male, 6'4", 250 lbs., bald with a beard, about 40 years old. CIs positively identified their dealer when shown a BMV photo of Ellis. They had purchased heroin from Blaze over a dozen times, contacting him via phone#216-407-1016. I field tested a sample of the suspected fentanyl, which did test positive for the presence of fentanyl. The fentanyl was sealed into drug bag#589960 and has been submitted to the county lab for testing, lab#2020-2394-0001 revealed the drugs weighed 0.76grams and tested positive for a mixture of heroin, carfentanil, fentanyl, cocaine, 4-ANPP, tramadol, and gabapentin.

Ellis had numerous felony convictions including kidnapping, GSI, drug trafficking, felonious assault, failure to comply, and an open case for failure to comply. I drafted a search warrant and affidavit for the target house at 638 East 127 St. On May 12, 2020 Cleveland prosecutor Gina Villa reviewed it.

On May 14, 2020 Honorable Judge Brian McCormack deemed probable cause existed and signed it.

On May 18, 2020 at 0628 hours members of the 5th district Vice unit. Det. Yasenchack 2362, Smith 1712, Kopchak 2139, McCully 1167, Sabolik 1021, Sumlin 2153, Oliver 808, Ptl. Hornblower 2477, K9 Officer Nichols 2454 with partner Hugo, Capt. Kane 6571 along with the Cleveland SWAT unit executed



Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 43-9 Filed: 05/07/21 2 of 3. PageID #: 406

the search warrant making entry via the front door after making several announcements. The target, William Ellis, was located upstairs during from the bedroom to the bathroom, and his girlfriend. Melissa Stalker, was located in the master bedroom. Both were advised of their constitutional rights. Swat advised us of a marijuana grow operation in the small upstairs room. Off. Nichols accessed the small operation including approximately 15 plants and variety of grow lights, fertilizers, soil, and grow containers. A search was conducted and the following drugs, guns, and property were seized:

- 1. Digital scale with residue bag#595034 located on kitchen table by 1167.
- 2. Bag with multiple bags of narcotics bag#595032 located in coat pocket in master bedroom by 2362.
- 3. Two grow lights located in grow room by 1712.
- 4. Drug press with residue bag#595030 located on top of kitchen cabinet by 2477.
- 5. Magazine loaded with 17 rounds located on living room table by 2139,2362.
- 6. Two cellphones located on top of kitchen cabinet by 2477.
- 7. Two scales with residue bag#595028 located on kitchen counter by 2477.
- 8. Seven and a half-pills bag#595104 located on upstairs bathroom floor by 1712.
- 9. Mail and paperwork located in master bedroom and livingroom by 2362.
- 10. Three cellphones located in master bedroom by 2362.
- 14. Bottle of pills bag#589194 located in master bedroom by 2362.
- 12. Seven containers with residue bag#93671 located in kitchen cabinet by 808.
- 13. Mentos container with 2 packets/straw bag#595124 located in northwest bedroom by 1021.
- 14. Pill in paper bag#589192 located in master bedroom purse by 2362.
- 15. Pills bag#595026 located on living room floor by 2362.
- 16. Bag with residue bag#595118 located in living room by 2139.
- 17. Cell phone located in northwest bedroom by 1021.
- 18. Cell phone located in Chevy Avalanche by 2477.
- 19. Recording device located in Chevy Avalanche by 1021.
- 20. \$775.00 cash located in master bedroom by 2362.
 - 21. Gun swab of loaded magazine located from magazine in living room by 2139.
 - 22. Gun swab of revolver located from Revolver in master bedroom by 2139.
 - 23. Three cellphones located in living room by 2362.
 - 24. Ring door camera located on front porch by 2362.
 - 25. Cut agent bag#594968 located in living room by 1021.
 - 26. Bag of baggies with residue bag#595024 located on stove by 2477.
 - 27. Bag of 5.56 ammo located in living room closet by 2477.
 - 28. Swan home security system located on house exterior by 2153, 2139.
 - 29. 9mm ammo located in living room closet by 2477.
 - 30. 7.62 ammo located in living room closet by 2477.
 - 31. Smith & Wesson .38 special revolver S#1D65044 with 5 rounds located in master bedroom by 2362.
 - 32. Marijuana plants (15) bag#595008 located in grow room by 1712.

During the search Ellis was interviewed and stated that when SWAT made entry he tried to flush pills down the toilet. Several pills and two bags with residue were found in route to and inside bathroom. Ellis began complaining about a variety of health issues despite just being released from the hospital yesterday. EMS conveyed Ellis to the Cleveland Clinic hospital. He was treated and released, tested negative for covid, and conveyed to county jail. Stalker was interviewed and stated she had stayed the night there, doesn't live there, and was unaware that Ellis was selling drugs. She did state she saw a silver revolver with wood handles upstairs in the master bedroom alongside the bed. The electric meter was disconnected, but the wiring was re-connected providing the household free electricity. First Energy was notified. Above gun, drugs, and seized property entered into 5th district evidence. Drug and gun to be conveyed to the county lab for analysis.

Case: 1:22-cv-00815-SO Doc #: 24-1 Filed: 08/31/23 105 of 121. PageID #: 363

Case: 1:20-cr-00302-BYP Doc #: 43-9 Filed: 05/07/21 3 of 3. PageID #: 407



William Ellis 638 East 127 St. Cleveland, Oh 44108, dome of 5", 250, bald, Bro. Charges to be indicted: drug trafficking, drug possession, drug manufacturing, cultivating marijuana, HWWUD, theft of public utilities, PCT.

This incident occurred within 1000ft, of EBC Daycare & Preschool Center at 12205 St Clair Ave. and Citizens Academy Elementary School at 12523 Woodside Ave.

Respectfully,

Jeffrey Yasenchack 2362

CLE\	/ELAI	ND DI	VISIO	N OF	POLICE	ZON	5th	PLATO	OONVICE	RADIC	CALL NO	5V85	
	[YTUC	REPO	ORT		TOU	R START	DAY Tues.	DATE 5-12-2020	T	IME 1900 HRS.	MILEAGE 94,183	
á n i							R FINISH_		5-12-2020		700 HRS.	94,199	
VEHICLE CO		CAR#	0400	400"	0.10.70.1111						TOTAL	16	
210P0		UC UC	GAS 0	S HALLMANN CARDON	SHOTGUN#	SHOTGUN# AMMO. BOX# PORTABLE TRANSCEIVER# 1852362					EQUIPMENT CH	ECK BY:	
CIRCLE DAMAGED AREAS	1 (3	5 10	TOP UNDER CA		DESCRIBE DAMAGE: OLD NEW D						NEW AGE REPORTED TO:	
Due for Se	ervice Mi	7 leage:	98,780)	Due for Se	ervice Da	te:	3-5-2019	Du	e for Servi	ce Sticker:	(Y)/ N	
SOURCE OF ASSIGNMENT: B-BROADCAST T-TELEPHONE D-DIST							CT O-ON	VIEW OR OTH				(1)/ (1	
SOURCE	REC'D.	TIME ARR.	COMP.	PRIORITY CODE	LOCATION A	ND NATU	RE OF ASS	SIGNMENT		DISPOSITI	ON	CAD NUMBER	
0		0900	0915		E147/WESTROF	PP AREA	CASE	INVEST	SURVEILLANC ADDRESSES FO		SEVERAL	1	
0		1	1		5D		RC / VEH	ICLE CHECK	СОМР				
0	100	1	1		5D		CASE	INVEST	FORM1/SW/EV YELLED AT ME	AL FORMI CO	ONF W/ CPTN SHE		
0					5D		LU	NCH	СОМР				
0		1410	1		CASTALIA		CASE	INVEST	SURVEILLAN	ICE K38010	4 FOLLOWED	1	
0		1	1		BRACKLAND	AREA	CASE INVEST		SURVEILLANCE				
0		1	1		E140/STCLA	IR	CASE	INVEST	SURVEILLANCE				
0		1			STEVENSON AREA		CASE	INVEST	TARGET MV UTL				
0		1615	/		5D		PAPERW	ORK/DUTY	COMP				
D		1645	1700		5D		RE	LIEF	СОМР				
			5 0										
		9.											
4						(*)							
									,				
										Wa		- 00	
								t t					
						*:					PLAIN'	TIFF'S	
		-									EXH	IBIT	
MISC, STATS	/EQUIPME	NT					*		89				
FEL. 0	MISD.	0	trf. 0		2000	<u>SUED</u> G. INFRAC'	rions 0	MISD. SUMM	ons 0 rai	DIO ASSIGNIV	ients 0		
64 MUH			#		anh.	11/	11	# 236		T.			
PASSENGE	R				DRIVER "	+	Maca		EXAMINED	& APRROVE	DBY (40)	C 110	
					Upt Se	effre	yase	ncháck #2363	z 55	T. He	Minde	#92m	

CLEV	/FI AP	יום מו	/ISIO	MOF	POLICE	ZONE	5tl	PLATO	OONA	RADIO CALL NO	5V85
DUTY REPORT								DAY	DATE	TIME	MILEAGE
	ia.	9011	1 % had 6	01 % II			R START_ R FINISH	Wed.	5-13-2020 5-13-2020	0800 HRS.	94,145
C OF C 71-ZC-1	rev. 12/98					100.				TOTAL	0
VEHICLE CODE# CAR# GAS CARD# SHOTGUN# 201P0104 UC 16005						AM	IMO. BOX#	1852362	RANSCEIVER#	CHECK BY:	
2 3 4)AMAGE:		1032302		2362	NEW		
CIRCLE DAMAGED AREAS 1 9 TOP 10 UNDER CA					(**)		360	MINOR	ਬ		REPORTED TO
Due for Se					Due for Se	rvice Da	ite:	- Constitution of the	Du	le for Service Sticker:	(Y)/N
SOURCE OF ASSIGNMENT: B-BROADCAST				T-TELEPHONE	D-DISTRI	CT O-ON	I VIEW OR OTH				
SOURCE	REC'D.	TIME ARR.	COMP.	PRIORITY CODE	LOCATION A	ND NATU	RE OF AS	SIGNMENT		DISPOSITION	CAD NUMBER
О		0800	1		SPRING ARE	EA'	CASE	INVEST	SURVEILLA	NCE	
0		1	1		E127/SHAW	AREA	CASE	INVEST	SURVEILLA	NCE	
0		1	1	p. s. Shingi	5D	City di	RC/VE	Н. СНЕСК	СОМР	3	
0		1	1		5D		CASE	INVEST	PREPPED FO	OR SW / BUY	4
0		1	1		5D .		CASE	INVEST	INTERVIEW	ED CI SIGNED UP	
0		1	1		5D		· LU	JNCH	СОМР		
0		1	1400		5D		RE	ELIEF	COMP X-TI	ME TAKEN	
	4							2			
	,										
						-			<u> </u>	2	
						-			 		
								~	1	- con-comp	
					10 68				-		
	X .										
									-		
									-		
					3.5 S.						
									<u> </u>	PLAIN	
				0	2					EXH	IBIT
										da O	
MISC. STATS	S/EQUIPME	ENT			2						-
ARRESTS			CITATION	S ISSUED	ISS	SUED.		- A-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-			
FEL. 0	MISD.	0	TRF. 0	M. MI	ISD. 0 PK	G. INFRAC	TIONS 0	MISD. SUM	MONS 0 RA	ADIO ASSIGNMENTS 0	-
			#					# 230	52 0	W-gyse	4
PASSENG	ER				DRIVER /	COM	hark	#2362	EXAMINE!	D & APPROVED BY	
					Wet yo	SCAC	11001	J	`		



[Cite as State v. Woods, 2012-Ohio-5509.]

Court of Appeals of Phio

EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA

JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION No. 98054

STATE OF OHIO

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

VS.

CLYDE WOODS JR.

DEFENDANT-APPELLEE

JUDGMENT: AFFIRMED

Criminal Appeal from the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court Case No. CR-556141

BEFORE: S. Gallagher, J., Sweeney, P.J., and Rocco, J.

RELEASED AND JOURNALIZED: November 29, 2012

Exhibit 35



ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

Timothy J. McGinty Cuyahoga County Prosecutor

By: Maxwell M. Martin Assistant Prosecuting Attorney The Justice Center, 8th Floor 1200 Ontario Street Cleveland, OH 44113

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE

Aaron T. Baker Aaron T. Baker Co., L.P.A. 38109 Euclid Avenue Willoughby, OH 44094

P3. I

SEAN C. GALLAGHER, J.:

- {¶1} Plaintiff-appellant, the state of Ohio, appeals from the trial court's decision to grant the motion to suppress of defendant-appellee, Clyde Woods, Jr. For the reasons set forth below, we affirm the ruling.
- Yasenchak worked the second shift. Because it was Halloween evening, the officers focused on children's safety in the area of East 105th Street. As they headed west on Adams Avenue, the officers were behind a black Lincoln MKZ that just turned onto Adams from East 105th Street. The speed limit on Adams is 25 m.p.h. The officers' speed was 35 m.p.h. They "paced" the Lincoln for a "little over two blocks" and concluded that the driver was exceeding the 25 m.p.h. speed limit.
- {¶3} Yasenchak activated the overhead light and sirens and stopped the Lincoln by the address of 9601 Adams. Yasenchak approached the driver's side, and Kopchak approached the passenger's side. The driver, Woods, was the only person in the Lincoln.
- {¶4} Woods stepped out of the car at Yasenchak's request. While Yasenchak patted down Woods, "some sort of large object is moving down [Woods's] pant leg all the way down to his boots." Yasenchak pulled up the bottom of Woods's pant leg and found one bag of suspected marijuana. The officers handcuffed Woods and arrested him

PB, 2

for using a motor vehicle to solicit drug sales, a violation of Cleveland Codified Ordinances 619.23. The officers then walked Woods back to the patrol car, advised him of his *Miranda* rights, and placed him in the back seat.

- {¶5} Yasenchak testified at the motion to suppress hearing about why he patted down Woods after he asked him to step out of the Lincoln:
 - A. As soon as he rolled down the window, I just detected the scent of marijuana.
 - Q. And are you familiar with the scent of marijuana?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Burned and unburned?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And can you describe for the Court why you're familiar with that scent?
 - A. I made a lot of arrests. I was in the narcotics unit for two and a half years [out of 14 with the department] * * *. Just numerous arrests, and personal experience with marijuana.
 - Q. Are you trained to identify that scent?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Are you qualified to identify that scent?
 - A. Yes. I've attended seminars from ATF, FBI, DEA all pertaining to drug investigations.

P5.3

- {¶6} After Woods's arrest, Kopchak proceeded to inventory the Lincoln's contents in preparation of towing the car. He testified at the motion to suppress hearing about the inventory search:
 - A. [I]n the trunk was an Ohio State bag, bookbag, backpack, I believe, and inside that backpack was [sic] two large bags of marijuana.
 - Q. Okay. Now, backing up, had you obviously, by the time that you're doing an inventory search of the car, you have located some marijuana on the person of Mr. Woods, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Any other marijuana found in the passenger compartment of the car?
 - A. No, I don't believe so.
 - Q. Okay. Were you did you detect the presence of any other marijuana?
 - A. When I was in the back seat, making sure there was no valuables in the back seat, the smell of unburned or fresh marijuana was still very strong in the vehicle.
 - Q. Okay. All right. So then you continue the inventory search and find the backpack, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And did you have to open the backpack, it was already open, or what?
 - A. It was already open.
 - {¶7} Kopchak next testified about his training relevant to the feel and smell of different drugs, including burnt and unburnt marijuana. He followed up with testimony that he made "probably too many to count" marijuana arrests during his five years on the police force. The marijuana found in the trunk of Woods's Lincoln was unburnt

P3.4

marijuana with a "strong odor," even in the three plastic bags inside each other making up State's Exhibit No. 3. The marijuana was in two individual large plastic freezer bags when found by Kopchak.

- Police Months also testified about his training on the Cleveland Police Department's tow policy. He stated that he read the tow policy a few years ago and he receives updates during roll call. According to him, he was accurate, thorough, and acted in a manner consistent with the policy when he inventoried Woods's vehicle. In the tow supplement, Kopchak did not list anything of value recovered from the trunk or the passenger compartment. He also lifted the hood of the Lincoln as part of the inventory search, "[j]ust to make sure everything's there that's supposed to be there."
- Moods ten days earlier, on or about October 21, 2011. Woods was briefly in police custody that day. When questioned as to why he was in custody, Kopchak responded, "[b]ecause he got out of his vehicle, exited his vehicle, and continued ignoring all my verbal commands to stop."
- {¶10} On November 8, 2011, Woods was charged with drug trafficking in violation of R.C. 2925.03(A)(2), with forfeiture and schoolyard specifications; possessing criminal tools in violation of R.C. 2923.24(A), with forfeiture specifications; and drug possession in violation of R.C. 2925.11(A), with forfeiture specifications.
- {¶11} On January 1, 2012, Woods filed a motion to suppress stop, arrest, and search. He asserted that the traffic stop and pat down were improper because he was not

P3:5

driving in violation of the posted speed limit. His arrest was improper as well because the officers had no evidence or any indication that he was soliciting drug sales from his vehicle. Finally, the search of the vehicle was not a proper inventory search. Woods requested that the trial court, therefore, suppress all evidence obtained by the officers.

{¶12} The trial court held a motion to suppress hearing on January 26, 2012. The trial court granted the motion and suppressed as evidence all of the marijuana discovered on Woods's person and in the trunk of his vehicle. In its opinion dated March 1, 2012, the court stated:

Since radar was not used by these officers to detect the speed of Defendant's vehicle, and because of the short distance traveled by Defendant's vehicle following his turn off East 105th Street, and because neither officer testified that they had specified training in detecting speed of another vehicle unaided by technology, it is unlikely that stopping Defendant's vehicle for traveling at 35 miles per hour in a 25-mile per hour zone is justified within the meanings articulated by *State v. Johnson* (1986) 34 Ohio App.3d 94 or *Brown v. Texas* (1979) 443 U.S. 47.

Testimony of the officers that the search was an inventory search of the vehicle was tantamount to a tow is disingenuous and merely a pretext for the claimed inventory. First of all, the stop, handcuffing and pat down were illegal since probable cause was absent. Secondly, the search of the trunk and most [s]uspiciously, the hood, along with the officer's failure to list all of the vehicle's contents on the inventory list suggests that the search of the vehicle was neither incidental to a tow nor for the purposes of inventory.

{¶13} The state timely appealed and challenges in one assignment of error, the trial court's ruling on the motion to suppress. The state argues that the police officers properly stopped Woods based on pacing his vehicle under the authority of *Richmond Hts. v. Myles*, 8th Dist. No. 86171, 2006-Ohio-542. It also argues that a police officer

P9.6

may properly order a motorist out of a vehicle when stopped for a traffic citation, even without suspicion of criminal activity, under the authority of *State v. Evans*, 67 Ohio St.3d 405, 1993-Ohio-186, 618 N.E.2d 162. According to the state, the smell of marijuana justified the pat down, the discovery of marijuana on Woods's person justified his arrest, and his arrest and detention justified the inventory search. For the following reasons, we reject the state's arguments.

and fact. See State v. Burnside, 100 Ohio St.3d 152, 2003-Ohio-5372, 797 N.E.2d 71. When ruling on a motion to suppress, the trial court serves as the trier of fact and is the primary judge of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight of the evidence. See State v. Mills, 62 Ohio St.3d 357, 582 N.E.2d 972 (1992); State v. Fanning, 1 Ohio St.3d 19, 437 N.E.2d 583 (1982). An appellate court must accept the trial court's findings of fact as true if they are supported by competent and credible evidence. Burnside at ¶ 8. The appellate court must then determine, without any deference to the trial court, whether the facts satisfy the applicable legal standard. Id.

{¶15} When determining whether an investigative stop is supported by a reasonable, articulable suspicion of criminal activity, the stop must be viewed in light of the totality of circumstances surrounding the stop. *State v. Bobo*, 37 Ohio St.3d 177, 524 N.E.2d 489 (1988), paragraph one of the syllabus. An officer's inchoate hunch or suspicion will not justify an investigatory stop. For example, "[t]he reputation of an area for criminal activity is an articulable fact upon which a police officer may legitimately

Py. 7

rely in determining whether an investigative stop is warranted." *Bobo* at 179. However, that fact alone is insufficient. The totality of the facts and circumstances before the officer must reasonably suggest that some specific criminal activity is afoot. *Id*. Courts must give "due weight to the officer's trained eye and experience" in reviewing the totality of the circumstances. *State v. Andrews*, 57 Ohio St.3d 86, 87-88, 565 N.E.2d 1271 (1991).

{¶16} Some appellate courts in Ohio, including ours, have held that an officer's visual estimation of a vehicle's speed alone is insufficient to support a conviction for speeding. See, e.g., Middleburg Hts. v. Campbell, 8th Dist. No. 87593, 2006-Ohio-6582, abrogated by Barberton v. Jenney, 126 Ohio St.3d 5, 9, 2010-Ohio-2420, 929 N.E.2d 1047. Prior to the Ohio Supreme Court's decision in Jenney, this court has recognized pacing as a legitimate means of determining speed. In Middleburg Hts. v. Quinones, 8th Dist. No. 88242, 2007-Ohio-3643, we stated:

[A]n arresting officer's visual estimates of speed alone are insufficient to convict persons of speeding beyond a reasonable doubt. See Cleveland v. Wilson, 8th Dist. No. 87047, 2006-Ohio-1947, at ¶ 7. However, as Quinones himself points out, that was not the only evidence presented. Officer Bulka testified that he paced Quinones' vehicle to determine his speed. Many Ohio courts, including this district, have found that pacing a car is an acceptable manner for determining speed. State v. Horn, 7th Dist. No. 04BE31, 2005-Ohio-2930, at ¶ 18; Middleburg Heights v. Campbell, 8th Dist. No. 87593, 2006-Ohio-6582, at ¶ 17.

{¶17} The above recognition of pacing is based on a police officer's visual perception that a vehicle is speeding, in combination with years of experience. Visual perception and years of experience constitute "specific and articulable facts which

PS.S

provide the police officer with reasonable grounds to make an investigatory stop[.]" State v. Porter, 11th Dist. No. 99-P-0061, 2000 Ohio App. LEXIS 4211, *10 (Sept. 15, 2000), quoting State v. Lawless, 11th Dist. No. 98-P-0048, 1999 Ohio App. LEXIS 2941 (June 25, 1999). See State v. Hammen, 5th Dist. No. 2012CA00009, 2012-Ohio-3628. The Seventh District relied on this language in recognizing pacing in Horn, and we, in Quinones, relied on Horn in recognizing pacing as a legitimate way of determining speed.

{¶18} The Ohio Supreme Court, however, in *Jenney*, 126 Ohio St.3d 5, 2010-Ohio-2420, 929 N.E.2d 1047, found that visual perception and general experience as a police officer is sufficient evidence to support an officer's unaided visual estimation of speed under certain circumstances. The court held:

A police officer's unaided visual estimation of a vehicle's speed is sufficient evidence to support a conviction for speeding in violation of R.C. 4511.21(D) without independent verification of the vehicle's speed if the officer is trained, is certified by the Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy or a similar organization that develops and implements training programs to meet the needs of law-enforcement professionals and the communities they serve, and is experienced in visually estimating vehicle speed.

Id. at syllabus.

{¶19} In Jenney, the Supreme Court concluded that a police officer's visual estimation of the defendant's speed was sufficient to support a conviction under R.C. 4511.21(D) because there was testimony offered at trial as to the officer's training, certification, and experience in visually estimating vehicle speeds. Id. at ¶ 2. Specifically, the officer testified that he was trained to visually estimate vehicle speed, was certified by a law enforcement training organization in visual estimations, and

P3.9

performed hundreds of visual speed estimations as a police officer. Id. at ¶ 21. The officer further testified that based on his training and experience, he estimated that the defendant's vehicle was traveling 70 m.p.h. in a 60 m.p.h. zone at the time of the traffic stop. Id. at ¶ 21-22.

{¶20} Accordingly, visual estimation of a vehicle's speed is sufficient evidence depending on the type of training provided to the police officer and the officer's certification and experience in visually estimating vehicle speed. In other words, visual estimation and the officer's general years of experience, without the training, certification, and actual experience in visually estimating vehicle speed, is insufficient evidence of a vehicle's speed.

{¶21} In this case, the totality of the officers' testimony was that Woods was exceeding the posted speed limit of 25 m.p.h. Yasenchak and Kopchak both testified about drug detection training and their respective years of service with the police department. Kopchak also testified about tow policy training. Neither officer testified, however, as to his training, certification, and experience in visually estimating vehicle speed. As a result, we find Yasenchak's and Kopchak's testimony as to their visual observation of Woods's speed insufficient under *Jenney*, 126 Ohio St.3d 5, 2010-Ohio-2420, 929 N.E.2d 1047. *See also State v. Starks*, 196 Ohio App.3d 589, 2011-Ohio-2344, 964 N.E.2d 1058 (12th Dist.); *State v. Riddle*, 6th Dist. No. OT-10-040, 2011-Ohio-1547.

P3.10

- {¶22} The state argues that even if the officers' testimony did not satisfy the Jenney standard, the testimony about pacing Woods's vehicle alone warranted a traffic stop for speeding. The trial court considered and rejected this argument, finding the officers did not have sufficient time or distance to reasonably use pacing as a means to determine the speed of Woods's vehicle.
- {¶23} Woods turned onto Adams from East 105th. This necessitated time and distance for the officers' vehicle to first catch up to Woods's vehicle and then commence pacing. The officers only followed Woods for two residential city blocks, too short a distance to establish a speeding violation based on pacing. The court was in the best position to evaluate the credibility of the officers' testimony on this point, and we decline to substitute our judgment for that of the trial court. *See Mills*, 62 Ohio St.3d 357, 582 N.E.2d 972; *Fanning*, 1 Ohio St.3d 19, 437 N.E.2d 583. The trial court's findings are, therefore, supported by competent and credible evidence, and the totality of the facts and circumstances before the officers does not otherwise suggest criminal activity. *Bobo*, 37 Ohio St.3d 177, 524 N.E.2d 489.
- {¶24} Under these circumstances, the trial court correctly concluded that the officers lacked probable cause to stop Woods for speeding. The ensuing searches of his person and vehicle were illegal, and thus the trial court properly suppressed the evidence discovered in those searches.
- {¶25} Even if we found that the officers validly stopped Woods for speeding, the trial court serves as the trier of fact and is the primary judge of the credibility of the

JS: 11

witnesses. Mills, 62 Ohio St.3d 357, 582 N.E.2d 972; Fanning, 1 Ohio St.3d 19, 437

N.E.2d 583. We would defer to and agree with the trial court's findings and conclusions relating to the testimony of Yasenchak and Kopchak: the "[t]estimony of the officers that the search was an inventory search of the vehicle was tantamount to a tow is disingenuous and merely a pretext for the claimed inventory," and "the search of the trunk and most [s]uspiciously, the hood, along with the officer's failure to list all of the vehicle's contents on the inventory list suggests that the search of the vehicle was neither incidental to a tow nor for the purposes of inventory." This is a classic example of a police officer's intentional use of an unlawful traffic stop, under a questionable codified ordinance, for the sole purpose of conducting a fishing expedition for evidence of another crime, and a tailored script at the motion to suppress hearing to justify the stop and subsequent searches. See State v. Bevan, 80 Ohio App.3d 126, 608 N.E.2d 1099 (11th Dist 1992).

{¶26} The state's assignment of error is accordingly overruled.

{¶27} Judgment affirmed.

It is ordered that appellee recover from appellant costs herein taxed.

The court finds there were reasonable grounds for this appeal.

It is ordered that a special mandate issue out of this court directing the common pleas court to carry this judgment into execution.

A certified copy of this entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to Rule 27 of the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

P9.12

SEAN C. GALLAGHER, JUDGE

JAMES J. SWEENEY, P.J., and KENNETH A. ROCCO, J., CONCUR